

THE
MONTHLY REVIEW
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. XLIV. — JULY, 1870. — No. I.

UNITARIANISM TO-DAY AND TO-MOR-
ROW.

BY REV. GEORGE H. HEPWORTH.

NOTHING is more evident than that a great change has come over the whole Unitarian body in the last score of years. There is now so little *esprit de corps*, so little desire on the part of ministers to work together, so little faith in any distinctive doctrines that can be called Unitarian, so little belief that the denomination can or ought to be double its present size, that a large number are beginning to feel that the case is well-nigh hopeless. Mr. Artemas Carter tells us that "It" — Meadville Theological School — "has decreased from twenty students to eight." Dr. Bellows says that "the lack of a sounder Christian faith is probably the greatest obstacle to our success." On a previous occasion, however, he said, "I am glad to have them — the Free Religionists — in the Unitarian body." It seems a little strange that he should say that he is glad to have a certain class of men in our body, and then add that one reason why we do not succeed better as a denomination is that they *are* in our body. Dr. Hedge says, "I do not care whether the Unitarian denomination lives or dies."

If these are the sentiments of our leaders where shall we be led? If the man on whom we have been accustomed to rely, because, though he was subject to the mood of the moment on other things, we were sure that he held Christianity in high esteem, says that "a large part of the *spiritual* life of the denomination lies in the very men whose theological opinions many of us utterly reject," how can we expect to arrive at any large increase? If the men who stand at the head of the denomination do not care a whit whether we live or die, or if they waver to such extent that on Tuesday they open their arms to warmly welcome the Free Religionists, and on Wednesday deplore the falling away of our body because the Free Religionists are in it, who can fail to predict that the slow pace of the last ten years will very soon change into a dead halt?

Is the condition of Unitarianism in Boston to-day satisfactory to its friends? At every meeting we use the set phrases which self-complacency suggests. An outsider who hears one of our speakers tell how we are influencing the civilization of the nineteenth century, how we are acting on the literature of the age, and how the general spirit of growing liberality which marks all denominations is simply the result of our ministrations, goes away with the impression that of course we have churches in every village on the continent, that we have numberless magazines and newspapers which find their way into every town between the Atlantic and the Pacific. When he learns that from the Hudson River to the Mississippi our churches can be almost counted on the fingers of his two hands, he sees a great light dawning on him. The truth is, that the age has influenced us far more than we have influenced it. Our statements concerning the amount of influence we are exerting are born of very excited imaginations. Perhaps one or two judges in some distant state become Unitarian, — we at once seize upon the fact and say, "See, there is no church in that town that tolerates our faith, and yet the subtle power of the American Unitarian Association has found its way there and converted that man;" and then we add, with a degree of self-satisfaction that would

adorn a better cause, "It is always so ; the intellectual men of the community are always of our way of thinking." The fact may be that the afore-mentioned judge never saw or heard of the American Unitarian Association, but became a Unitarian by simply thinking his way out of orthodoxy ; and there is no doubt that scores of such men would be vastly helped out of their embarrassment if we could put into their hands, while they are groping in the dark, a simple statement of faith as represented by our body.

But about Boston. Several of the most prominent churches of that city are either without ministers, or their ministers are disabled, or have retired from active duty. It is not many years since the pulpits of Boston were renowned for their eloquence, their scholarship, and the marked bias they gave to public opinion. Lothrop had a great following ; Bartol, through the delicacy and subtlety of his thought, exerted a wide influence ; Gannett was undoubtedly one of the most effective pulpit forces of his time ; Robbins and Rufus Ellis were men largely trusted and greatly respected. Now all things are changed. Account for it as you will, the fact, the awfully stubborn fact, which will not down at any one's bidding, remains, that Boston Unitarianism has neither the scholarship, nor the pulpit power, which was its chief characteristic twenty years ago. Said a trusted brother to me the other day, " Unitarianism will have to be planted all over again in Boston."

Look a little further. It is not difficult to detect a widespread feeling of despondency and discontent in the lay part of our body. One of our brethren complains of a statement of faith, because it will cut off from our communion, among others, the conservative element. We think this to be a very great mistake. The conservative element, as represented by men like Dr. Robbins, has already removed itself very far from any sympathy with, or interest in the doings of the American Unitarian Association, simply because we are made up of such a heterogeneous mass of theological opinions that we cannot have any distinct policy without treading on somebody's theories ; and as such a thing is not to

be thought of, we concluded on Tuesday morning of anniversary week that it is unsafe for us to have decided opinions upon any subject whatever, unless we except that vague subject which is the fetich of the denomination, commonly called freedom. Dr. Hedge said that Unitarianism "is a collection of theologies; as many, perhaps, as there are individuals." He might have gone still further and called it, "The Museum of Theologies," in which is collected, in unsympathetic proximity, every curious and eccentric style of theological thought which can find no resting-place in any other body. Dr. Bellows says, that there are such vast differences among Unitarians, that there are no fundamental principles on which any large proportion of us can agree. He is not willing to submit "his Christian faith to any statement which the Unitarian body, as such, is prepared to make, or can honestly make." No wonder that every time we meet in convention we spend so much of the day in discussion that no hour is left to talk of work. How can we work together so long as we think a thousand miles apart? The man who believes that his first duty is to lead all men into a love for Christ may talk as much as he pleases about working with his brother, who loses no opportunity to declare that Christ was at fault many times, not only in doctrine, but also in life; but the thing cannot be done. It is for this reason that Unitarian Conventions have never amounted to anything. Once in a while we make an extra effort, as at the first meeting of the National conference, and determine that everything shall go on smoothly; but, before the session is over, the old trouble comes up afresh. The Christian Unitarians quietly settle back into their places; the Radicals hold their own meetings in their own way, and the outside world looks on and laughs at us, and with good reason.

Some of the most influential of our laymen, men whom we cannot spare, who add weight and give dignity to any association they may join, leave us and join other denominations simply because they say we repudiate Christianity, in that we have not the courage to declare that it is the basis of our organization and ministry. This policy of expediency is kill-

ing us. For fear of hurting somebody's feelings, we refuse to lay the corner-stones of our faith in Christianity, and, in order to make our body a little larger in point of numbers, we give up the very part of our denominational life which links us to all the other sects of Christendom. If it is true that we have no faith and no policy, who will wonder if we ultimately achieve our own ruin? If we dare not say in open meeting, nay, if we cannot say through a majority vote at any meeting, that we believe in Jesus Christ as our Leader and our Lord, what have we to complain of if we are losing power day by day.

Thousands and tens of thousands in the community, who now attend on other forms of worship, believe in what is called Channing Unitarianism. If we could only say to them and to the world that we have any well-defined belief, they would at once come into our communion. But why should they leave a sect that boasts of its belief in Christ as a great privilege, to come into a body that could not pass by a majority vote a resolution that it accepted Jesus Christ as THE SON OF GOD. They say, and say truly, that the errors of Orthodoxy are harmless to the young in comparison with the errors of Unitarianism; that they prefer to risk their boys and girls under the influences of any of the evangelical sects rather than to subject them to the thick atmosphere of doubt which pervades our whole denomination.

There are also scores of ministers whose fresh lives would be a great accession to our body, who are with us so far as the cardinal doctrines, as they are represented by Clarke, are concerned, but who hesitate about coming into our ranks because of the nebulousness which seems to be our strong point.

But, it is said, there are no greater differences among us than exist in other sects. We are told that it is impossible to state what the tenets of Orthodoxy are; that there is a wide chasm between the theology of Princeton and that of Andover. It is said that the evangelical sects could not, in this age, agree upon a statement of faith any more than we can. The assertion is a very plausible one, but a single moment's

examination will show how utterly baseless it is. The evangelical sects allow a large liberty of thought, but that undue *license* which destroys all homogeneity would not be tolerated for an instant. A candidate for ordination might hoot at the old dogma of infant damnation, at the idea of eternal misery, total depravity, or the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures; but if he should declare his belief that the Bible was on a par with the writings of Plato or Socrates, would he receive the approbation of his council? Would he not be told quietly that, while he had an undoubted right to hold and to preach these opinions, the Orthodox market was not the place where they were salable? They would do this in justice to themselves, and out of respect to the cause which they represent. Within the wide limits of Christianity, as a specially revealed religion, one may enjoy great liberty of individual opinion; but when he oversteps that magic circle by so much as the thousandth part of an inch, the whole denomination rises in protest, and the offending clergyman packs up his trunk of doubts and negations, and takes immediate passage for our ranks, where he is warmly welcomed, no matter what he believes or what he does not believe.

In our own denomination, however, what are called differences of opinion are quite another thing. We have in fellowship with us not only the Christian Unitarian, who would not lay his finger upon any part of the Scriptures to remove it, but also the Free Religionist, who would lay his whole hand on the Bible, and throw it away bodily; not only the man who believes that Christianity was miraculously revealed, but also the man who says that it is merely one of the religions of the world, and very far from having anything supernatural about it, and in many respects not the best religion. Our differences have a vastly wider range than those of any other religious sect. They cross the boundary of Christianity, and go to the utmost limits of Theism, which laughs at the rite of baptism, scoffs at the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, calls the miracles of the New Testament old men's fables, speaks of the blood of Christ and the blood of Cock Robin in the same breath, and

tells us we have already had too much of Jesus Christ, and that he should be laid to rest. Now we may boast of liberty, but it seems to some of us that we have a little too much of that article. A man has just as good a right to hold these opinions as I have to hold mine, or you yours. He has a right to preach them if he can get any one to listen to him; but if he is recognized as a Unitarian minister in full fellowship with the denomination, there are many who will cease to boast of that body as the home of true religion. The American Unitarian Association will not long command the confidence of the majority of our laymen and ministers if they send such men out from Sunday to Sunday to preach the word.

A practical man said to me the other day, "If I should conduct my business on the principles on which you run your denomination, I should be bankrupt in three months. You are none of you in deadly earnest." I fear he was more than half right. We are playing fast and loose so much that the confidence of the community is ebbing away. Who ever heard of any success attending an organization which was so careless of the eternal right, and so careful of the feelings of its members, that it did not dare to say whether or not it had any fundamental plane of unanimity. If the Lord acts up to his promise to deny in heaven those who deny him on the earth, we can easily predict that the Unitarian denomination has not a very hopeful future.

But, says one of our leaders, we shall cut some one off. Well, is that so terrible a thing to do? If we insist upon it that things shall be called by their right names, and stand in their proper places, are we doing injustice to any one? If we *are* a Christian body, and certain persons complain because we use the word "Christian," and call us narrow and bigoted, which shall we do, give up the word "Christian," and call ourselves simply a religious body, or stand by our flag, and part in friendly way with those who will not fight with us? Practically we have already given up the name, and are simply aiders and abettors of Free Religion. The Radicals revile us as fossils, and yet they live out of our treasury.

The most thoroughly believing men in the denomination are yearly giving money which is expended for the spread of doctrines which the generous donors abhor. At present the only way to bring the Association to its senses is either to give money on certain conditions, or else to stop giving altogether. The latter is the safer method. When the time comes round to take up the next yearly contribution, I hope that those societies which are decidedly Christian in faith — and such generally give most generously — will see to it that their money is spent for the spread of what *they* think is the truth. I wish that the great body of the laity, who, I have the best of reasons for thinking, desire to see the denomination put squarely and unequivocally upon a Christian platform, would withhold their annual contributions until the American Unitarian Association decides whether or not it is a Christian organization. If it decides that it is such an organization, I hope the laity will demand that it shall at once shelve its present policy of voting its money for the support of ministers who, under the cover of Unitarian Christianity, are freezing their societies to death by hopeless negations, and devote their funds to the encouragement of those brethren who are neither ashamed nor afraid of the word "Christian."

I have no word of criticism to offer against Mr. Lowe, or the gentlemen whom we elect as our executive committee. Mr. Lowe must please all parties. That is his business. The denomination has never directed him to do otherwise. He has no right to help one party more than another. He must do the best he can under the circumstances, i.e., he must see to it that he does not crowd the Radicals too much, and that the evangelical Unitarians have nothing to complain of. He has done his difficult work well, and as few men could do it.

He says in his report, "If at any time a resolution were offered declaring our discipleship to Jesus Christ, and our acceptance for our guide of his teachings, as revealed to us in the Gospels, I should most heartily vote for it." Well, I have very grave doubts whether such a resolution would pass. We did manage to call Jesus Christ our Lord at the National

Conference, but we had a very trying time in doing it. We could not have done it at all without inserting, in parenthesis, what Mayo calls a "conscience clause," to the effect that if any one did not believe that Christ was Lord, it was exactly as well as though he did. What a profound resolution to issue from a denomination that thinks it is influencing the century: *Resolved*, That it is so. [But if any thinks it is not so, it is just as well. No questions asked.]

Mr. Lowe says again, "The term 'Christian' is so incorporated into the articles of constitution of this Association, *and with all its history*, that no one has a right *in the administration of its affairs* to forget it, or do anything that would make others doubt that it is, first of all, a *Christian* organization." This is a very remarkable statement. It is all the more remarkable when one remembers that this very Association sends out every week men to preach whose opinions they do not dare to endorse as Christian. Here is the root of the whole difficulty. The American Unitarian Association has no policy. It is trying to do two things at once. It is unwilling to offend Radicalism, and it does not dare to offend Christian Unitarianism. It is not loyal even to its own announced principles of action. If it is true that the officers of our Association have no right to "do anything that would make others doubt that it is, first of all, a Christian organization," why is there, all through the body, such a wide-spread distrust of it in this very particular?

Now, to my mind, one thing is certain. The two sections of our body are growing wider apart. The next few years will show us plainly that it is utterly impossible for us to work together. The first step at separation was taken by Radicalism. It took the step in justice to itself. It began a movement which makes us all respect it for its earnestness of purpose. The Radicals could find no satisfaction in the general discussions at our meetings; they felt themselves to be simply elements of discord amongst us, and so they formed an organization called the Free Religious Association. In their own hall they can safely discuss their own concerns, and not be intruded upon by the old-school Unitarianism.

rians. No thoughtful man doubts that there is a very serious antagonism of purpose and thought between the Free Religious Association and the American Unitarian Association, as described by Mr. Lowe. It is best that they should have their separate organizations, and do their work in their own way. But this curious anomaly is presented: we cannot go into their association, and throw our influence against the methods they see fit to pursue; the aim of the body is so well defined in the public mind that it would be regarded as an obvious intrusion for one of the evangelical Unitarians to offer a resolution that the whole policy of the Association was wrong; but the Radicals would not be regarded as intruders, indeed they would be doing what they have a perfect right to do, if they should attend one of our American Unitarian Association meetings *en masse*, and negative a resolution that the Unitarian faith is a Christian faith. They have their own organization to do their work, and, besides, a pretty strong lien on ours. We have simply our own organization, badly crippled by an assembly of opposing forces. The evangelical part of the body is at this moment wholly without the means of carrying forward a single project. The American Unitarian Association is not pledged to either wing. Its fortunes vary according to the way the wings flap.

The National Conference is, at present, in precisely the same predicament. It is, undoubtedly, the best organization which the denomination has had in a full score of years. It saved the body from immediate disintegration. All honor to Dr. Bellows, who conceived the plan, and who has carried it on thus far so successfully. But can we not all see even here that temporizing spirit which will not meet the real issue fairly, but which compromises for the sake of a peace which never yet came with anything like a compromise? If Dr. Bellows will gather about him the right sort of men, and no man is more able to do it than he, and will lay down the platform of faith which was the glory of Unitarianism twenty-five years ago, and will inaugurate a policy, at once generous and well-defined, he will achieve the grandest work of his life. We are now in a snarl. No one

can tell how long the line is, or how strong it is. If we could be straightened out, and one end tied firmly to the ring-bolt of historic Christianity, we could with the other enclose such numbers that we should be vastly surprised at ourselves. We are told that the old-school Unitarians are to the Radicals as three to two. With this large majority in point of numbers, we are utterly unable to stir hand or foot, and are so bound by the rhetorical cords of the word "freedom" that we are free only to keep still. We are, in point of fact, in the hands of the Radicals. Whenever a man who desires to see the body get on tries to stir the denomination to the manufacture of more effective machinery, we are told that we ought not to look for outward prosperity; that our mission is not to increase; that, on the contrary, our mission may be to quietly die out: and if this cruel talk does not succeed in killing the resolution, the Radicals vote in solid mass against it; and the two parties together manage to keep us in a perfectly frigid state.

What can be done? To my mind the problem is easy of solution. Let the evangelical Unitarians do precisely what the wiser Radicals have already effectively done, — organize. Let those of our body who sympathize with each other form an association, to be called by any name you please. Why should we not do this? We shall never be fairly represented before the world until we do something of the kind. Shall we be exclusive? No more so than every body of men is that has a common platform of agreement. No more exclusive than the Radicals themselves. They congregate about a common centre in obedience to the eternal law which draws sympathetic minds together. Let us who think alike on the other side get together and confirm and help each other. Has not the time arrived for this? If we form our organization we can issue our Statement of Faith, not simply by a majority vote, which may possibly do injustice to the minority, but by a vote full, free, and unanimous.

Then all parties in the Unitarian body would be satisfied. The Radicals would have their organization, and we ours. A better feeling would prevail, and a new life would be given to all.

UNITARIAN CREED-MAKING.

BY E. H. SEARS.

BEFORE the meetings of anniversary week, intimations were thrown out here and there that a movement was to be made towards the adoption of a creed for the Unitarian body. Not being in the secret, we had not the least idea in what shape it was to come till our Brother Hepworth offered his resolution to the American Unitarian Association, which read as follows:—

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed by this meeting to prepare and present, at their earliest convenience, to this body, for its approval and endorsement, a statement of faith, which shall, as nearly as may be, represent the religious opinions of the Unitarian denomination.

It did not fail to occur to some who were present that the Unitarian Association is in no sense a representative body, but a voluntary society of individuals, and therefore has no right to make an "authoritative" declaration for the denomination; so that Rev. Mr. Mayo moved as an amendment that the whole subject be referred to the council of the National Conference. The resolution, as amended, was ably debated, but lost by an overwhelming negative. But it was ably supported, both by the mover and by Robert Collyer; and, though the rejection was so emphatic, Mr. Hepworth gave notice that he should renew the subject. "I know," said he, "I am right, and I am going to keep this thing going until I do get it. I shall fight it out, if it takes all summer." So we infer that it is a subject reserved for the National Conference next fall.

In our article on "The Unitarian Crisis," we have shown, we think, with sufficient fullness and clearness, that any human creed whatever would be opposed to the very genius of Liberal Christianity. It would reverse all our Unitarian traditions, and read all the lessons backward which we have been teaching the world these fifty years. Is there any such

exigency as to demand such a change, or to warrant us in rubbing out the lessons of the past? We think not. We would do any consistent and reasonable thing to help a man of such noble purposes as Brother Hepworth's are; but not if he were Michael the Archangel contending with the devil could we vote to help him in that way.

To make a sort of average embodiment of Unitarian opinions, and hold them up as authoritative Unitarianism for the whole denomination, would fossilize our theology, while as yet it is but the faint stammering of the full gospel of Christ. We should have a respectable Unitarian orthodoxy put for Christianity, while as yet we have not half learned it out. Those deeper inspirations of the Christ of consciousness which bring the soul into ever nearer approximations to the glorified Christ himself must be arrested under any such Unitarian orthodoxy, or excluded as having no place in "our body." Such a movement would tend to consolidation, and thence endanger the independency of the churches.

If Brother Hepworth wants any campaign documents, there is a way to obtain a great deal better one than any such statement as we have supposed. Five years ago a convention met at New York representing the majority of the Unitarian churches in a body of delegates, both clerical and lay, which in character and intelligence would compare favorably with any ecclesiastical body that was ever convened. They made not a creed, but a confession of faith, simple yet clear and full, in harmony with the covenants of the churches, avowing discipleship of the Lord Jesus Christ. It was adopted by a nearly unanimous vote. It struck the key-note of Liberal Christianity, and men of all ranges of opinion within the Christian faith were perfectly satisfied. Now if Brother Hepworth can persuade his brethren to get rid of the nullifying Ninth Article, he will have the Constitution of the National Conference with a confession of faith which is precisely like that with which the first apostles went forth for the conversion of the world.

Then his own society can adopt another under this general one, and they can make it just as special as they please.

They can put into it all their church life and experience, and their pastor can make it conform to his loftiest Christian ideals. Many of our liberal societies have done this very thing. They have adopted declarations of faith, drawn up at length and in detail, not as creeds or as tests of church-membership, but as publishing to the world their highest conceptions of the Christian doctrine and Christian duty. When Brother Hepworth's society have done the same, he will have two campaign documents. He can hold up the first, and show that he and his people belong to the body of Christian believers; and he can hold up the second as showing how high among his own people the advancing tide of Christian faith and experience has risen, and thereby provoke every other church to faith and good works. And his society can change their declaration of faith, and make it more complete with every new opening of the heavens and every new descent of the Holy Spirit upon them. And then if every liberal church would do the same we should have, not a sect with a fossilized creed, but a fraternity of churches under one discipleship, maintaining unity in diversity; Christian union with Christian liberty and church independency. A good many of our liberal societies, we said, have these declarations of faith; and we can bear testimony to their worth and potency, not only in defining to the members of a society their own form of Christianity, but in shutting the mouths of false witnesses by whom their faith had been misrepresented or reviled. A Christian denomination so constituted would never become a lagoon of stagnant waters, but be always in motion, and "many like the billows, yet one like the sea," move under celestial attractions, and with wave pressing upon wave.

We have written this on the supposition that Brother Hepworth was in quest of a creed, or an average statement of Unitarian opinions, to go forth as an authoritative document. We have supposed it because the subsequent proceedings of the meeting assumed it. We now say, however, that we do not believe that he wanted any such thing. From what we know of him, we believe he would be the last man who would

seek to fossilize the denomination ; and we apprehend it will turn out, when we get his whole idea, that the debate of that Tuesday morning was a firing off of sky-rockets without any mark to aim at. We shall see when he brings forward his proposition at the next Conference.

There was another quite remarkable feature of the same meeting of the Unitarian Association, — a paper, read by its secretary, on "The Policy" of the Association. It was written in Mr. Lowe's best spirit, which we need not say was charmingly sweet and beautiful ; and if fact and logic were both to be ignored or set aside, there is no man living who could have done it with more godly simplicity and sincerity.

The paper consists of three divisions. The body of it is a plea against creeds, made in such connection as would lead the reader to suppose that those who have been called the "right wing" of the denomination wanted a creed adopted by the Association as a remedy against the Radicalism which has invaded it. The facts, so far as we know them, are all the other way, and the persons referred to would no more trust to a human creed to keep out the flood-tide of unbelief than they would trust to Dame Partington's broom to sweep the Atlantic ocean into its channels. All of Brother Lowe's thunder in this direction may be found in the article in this Magazine, which he quotes and comments upon, — only his thunder is of a more dulcet kind and sounds like a pleasant song.

In the first part of his statement, Brother Lowe argues at length that it is impossible practically to draw any dividing line so as to exclude the Radical opinions which are now propagated by the money and influence of the Association. This argument he elaborates at considerable length, and with great ingenuity and plausibility. Then, in the last portion of his paper, he proceeds to do the exact thing which he had just shown to be impossible. It is fortunate for him that he was to refute himself, for no one else could have done it so neatly and with such admirable grace. He says, —

"If to-day, or at any time, a resolution were offered, simply declaring our discipleship to Jesus Christ and our acceptance

for our guide of his teachings, as revealed to us in the Gospels, I should most heartily vote for it. Mark the distinction between this and the creed to which I object. This does not define the test of discipleship as regards particulars of one's belief, but leaves every one free to his own interpretation. No one would be excluded who should profess and call himself Christian. It would only be presumed, as it is fair to presume, that no one would thus profess who did not, in some real sense, so look to Christ as to make it fitting to adopt the name."

"Mark the distinction." Yes, mark it. ' Nothing is easier. It is what we have been marking this long while, and trying to make men see. The impossibility of the first half of the statement vanishes with a stroke of the pen. What Brother Lowe says he would vote for so heartily is all that anybody ever wanted or asked for, so far as we know, for we apprehend Brother Hepworth himself would have been satisfied with it.

But mark another distinction. It is one thing for Brother Lowe to tell us what *he* would vote for ; quite another thing as to what the Association would vote for *and make their basis of operations*. He has given us a confession of his own faith, which no one ever doubted was full of the very sunshine of the gospel. Why did he not put it into the form of two resolves,—first, that "discipleship to Jesus Christ, and our acceptance for our guide of his teachings as revealed to us in the Gospels," are the basis of the action of this Association, and, secondly, that its officers be instructed to conform to the spirit of this resolution in the disbursement of the funds entrusted to them ?

Put in that shape, so as to mean something decisive on the part of the Association, Brother Lowe knows, as well as we do, they would have encountered determined opposition, though at his request they might have passed. Certain we are they would have passed ten to one if put to vote in the churches of the denomination. As it is, the statement puts a negative over against an affirmative, and holds them in equilibrium. What we long to see, as a life-member of the

Association, — and hundreds more with us who would be glad to help on its work without mental reservations, — is the Secretary's idea put into these two decisive resolves. He will not say this is uncalled for if he is cognizant of all the facts of the case, and if he remembers his own letter to Mr. Weiss. It would put the Association into a position clear, unequivocal, and strong, which certainly it had partially surrendered. It would relieve the Secretary of embarrassments and invidious responsibilities, and smooth out the way before him. It would give Mr. Hepworth a solid foundation on which to stand and do his work efficiently with other noble workers like himself so far as the Association can do it. More than all, it would turn the Association unreservedly towards the Christ to receive the glory of his countenance and the fertilizing blessings of the Spirit of God. The position once taken and held, the dollars might take care of themselves. Its moral prestige is worth more than the dollars. If any of them after that were diverted from their true end by some one's mistake or unfaithfulness, the Association nevertheless would stand clear before God and man.

A MAN traveling upon the road espies some great castle ; sometimes it seems to be nigh, another time afar off ; now on this hand, anon on that ; now before, and by and by behind ; when all the while it standeth still unmoved. So a man that goes in a boat by water thinks the shore moveth, whereas it is not the shore, but the boat, that passeth away. Thus it is with God : sometimes he seemeth to be angry with the sons of men, another time to be well pleased ; now to be at hand, anon at a distance ; now showing the light of his countenance, by and by hiding his face in displeasure ; yet he is not changed at all. It is we, not he, that are changed. He is immutable in his nature, in his counsels, and in all his promises ; whereas all creatures have and are subject to change, having their dependence on some more powerful agent ; but God being only independent, is (as the schoolmen say) *omnino immutabilis*, altogether immutable — *John Spencer*.

THE MODERN SPIRIT IN CHRISTIANITY.

A GLANCE AT EUROPE IN 1869.

BY SAMUEL OSGOOD, D.D.

LAST summer I went into a store in Berlin to look at some of the specimens of iron ornaments for which that city is so famous, and the bright girl in attendance showed me, among other things, a pair of sleeve-buttons or studs, with a handsome classic head on each, the one a man's head, the other a woman's. I liked them, and bought them, but thought them too large to be worn, and told her so; but she replied, "They are very modern." I suppose that she meant to say, that they were quite the fashion, as was probably the case; but it struck me that her words meant more than she was aware of, and that those two Greek heads stand pretty well for the modern spirit in our time. The Greeks, as Matthew Arnold so well says, were the moderns of their age, and through them all things were made new, Christianity itself coming to Europe by the medium of their language and under the definition of their acute thought. Their spirit wakes up from time to time, and had much to do with the Protestant Reformation, and with the equally memorable reformation now going on in the Christian world. Stout Martin Luther, hearty German as he was, had something of the Greek in his composition, and took on his shoulders something of the principle of Paul, who insisted so much upon a faith that comes home to each man's consciousness, and does not wait upon the decrees of councils either for its authority or efficacy. Melancthon and Erasmus were full of the old classic spirit, and made it tell mightily upon the new times coming. The Roman Church in its way felt the same influence, and the *renaissance* of Roman art came from the uprising of the classic taste and genius that had so long been buried in tombs and ruins. The Greek is rising still, and far stronger in Germany, England, and

America than in Athens or Corinth. It is the modern spirit that looks into the laws and reasons of things, loves liberty and whatever inspires liberty, and tries, as far as possible, to put friendly co-operation in the place of arbitrary power, or to cherish institutions that secure a certain freedom with order, and recognize the rights of the individual within the fellowship of the many. Some readers may not like the definition of the modern spirit, and may think it too tame, and may insist that it is the essential trait of our modern mind to turn all old institutions upside down and go for what is new mainly because it is new. But this revolutionary radicalism is not modern, but as old as lawlessness and self-will. It did indeed show itself in the madness of the modern reaction against the tyranny of the old castes; and the hungry and savage mob struck right and left at property and persons, as if the main thing were to destroy the things that were in order to be sure of any new good. But all thoughtful people are sick of this revolutionary fury now, and it is a folly that has been played out and died away, even in France, the pet home of revolutions. The large majority there seem to like anything better than the mob spirit, and there is no surer way for a demagogue to make a fool of himself in the eyes of the public than to talk atheism and advise an onslaught on all rights of property. Our recent forms of religious enthusiasm are not of the destructive, revolutionary kind, and the fine transcendental theorists of the Brook Farm class, and the coarse citizens of Brigham Young's New Canaan, are more conspicuous for what they affirm than for what they deny, and instead of assailing all law, they aim to establish a new social order.

It is a charming summer day, and I am writing under the trees in the country, with no small misgiving that I have stumbled upon a subject too large for my present thought; and it may be as well for me to handle it in the easiest way, and tell your readers some of my impressions of the modern spirit in Europe during my observations there last year, instead of trying to go much into the philosophy of the subject, or to analyze the Christian thought of Europe in

this nineteenth century. Perhaps the year was more memorable for commercial and civil movements and events than for religious discussions; and the opening of the Suez Canal and the Pacific Railroad, the consolidation of Northern Germany under the lead of Prussia, and the confirmation of our American liberty and prosperity under Gen. Grant's presidency, may be the most important events of 1869 in the eyes of most readers. Perhaps the movements during that year that are called theological belong quite as much to the sphere of politics, such as the Irish-Church Bill, the Swedish law of toleration, the debates on liberty of worship in Spain, and even the council called "œcumenical" in Rome, since the probable motive for calling this council was the growth of modern civil liberty, especially the progress of free thought in Austria, Spain, and Italy, the very nations that had been the strongholds of the Papacy. Yet in all these movements the modern spirit has been at work, and the great human mind has been calling for fair play under good institutions that secure freedom and law. It makes my blood tingle, and yours too, dear reader, does it not? as I copy now from a reliable Church Chronicle of 1869 the fact that Castelar's speech for liberty of conscience in the Spanish Cortes last year brought out seven thousand addresses of approbation, eight hundred telegraphic congratulations, and the citizenship of honor from one hundred cities. The Article 20, for which he spoke, was carried by one hundred and seventy-seven votes against seventy-five, and Article 21 was carried by one hundred and sixty-four votes against twenty.

All these movements undoubtedly have more or less connection with the Christian religion, and it will be found that the New Testament is quoted more or less by all the movement men of our time. It is still the leading power in all true civilization, and the earnest and thoughtful mind of Europe is now, probably more than at any time since the wane of the godless materialism of the eighteenth century, ready to say so. I cannot put into any tolerable compass a survey of intelligent European opinion upon the meaning and worth of the New Testament, and must be content with saying what

no fair-minded reader will deny, that the freest and most hopeful literature of our time looks to its teachings as the best light of the world. When the new criticism began its war upon the old despotism of the priesthood and the old legalism of dogmatists, and found but a brief resting-place in the dry ethics that were made to supply their place, what strange work was done with the New Testament, and what learning and pains were taken to explain away its facts and to empty its great truths of all spirit and life. How oddly the standard works of the early rationalists now read, and how utterly insipid, even to the new rationalists of our day, the cold deism that the vulgar rationalism offered in place of the gospel of miracles and the spirit appears. The criticism which, in the higher sense of the term, now deserves the name of modern begins in the upper plane of thought, and starts with the divinely human personality of Christ. Jesus is not ridiculed now by scholars here as a visionary, reviled as a fanatic or impostor, nor patronized with faint praise as a moralist. He is looked upon as the providential person who was sent to be the head of the new kingdom of faith and humanity, and the spring of blessed life in all ages to come. Schleiermacher, who was a Greek of the Greeks more than any other modern, thus presented this idea, and he heads the movement for the restoration of faith among the higher classes of European inquirers. It was interesting to trace the marks of his influence in Berlin; to sit in the University Hall, where his bust, with that of Neander, looks down from its place of honor, and to converse with the illustrious scholars who carry out his work. Dorner, who is, I suppose, the leader of the liberal orthodoxy of Prussia, assured me that the gain which Christianity had of late years been making with the intelligent classes was owing to Schleiermacher more than to any other one man; and he firmly believed that his hold was strengthening upon sober German thought, as it is becoming clearer, that his cardinal principle, that Christianity comes home to our highest consciousness, is bringing out new confirmation from earnest souls and allying itself in so many ways with the broadest and deepest studies of the

Scriptures and the obvious experience of individual and social life.

In England the same tendency shows itself in quarters very various, and is bringing many minds together from opposite directions. The new school of English theology is very much of the Schleiermacher type. Coleridge was perhaps its most conspicuous philosophical leader, and all of the liberal churchmen show something of his influence. The dissenters have in some respects gone beyond churchmen in expounding the Christianity of consciousness, and James Martineau, in his funeral discourse upon John James Taylor, to which I listened, declared that in his opinion Mr. Taylor was superior to Schleiermacher as a student of Christian history and an expounder of Christian truth. But it seems to me that Taylor, like Martineau himself, was deficient in important elements of Christian philosophy, and that he fell below the great German sage alike in his feeble recognition of the great fact of hereditary evil and the sinfulness of our race, and also in the positive power and universal bearing of the divine grace which came in Christ to give redemption from sin. Mr. Martineau and Mr. Taylor are both too strong examples of individualism and of self-culture to do justice to the catholicity and power of Schleiermacher's doctrine. Mr. Martineau's beautiful book of worship, which so ignores sin and the penitential side of religion, and almost repudiates the mediatorial work of Christ, answers but poorly to the heart of that great work on Christian faith which has won such a place of honor by the side of Calvin's "Institutes," as vindicating the gospel of grace before the philosophical thinkers of this nineteenth century.

Perhaps in their stubborn quarrel with their evangelical opponents the liberal churchmen of England have come short of the true wisdom as well as the true temper; for as a class they lack contrition and unction, and tend more to fine scholarship than to evangelical faith. The volume of "Essays and Reviews" did very well as a series of magazine papers, but had small merit as lessons in theology. It showed more of the Greek Academy than of the Christian Church, and its

master spirits have one by one left the theological field, except Dr. Temple, who has emphasized the deeper spirit of his recent thought by withdrawing his essay from the future editions of the papers. That pure and genial man, Prof. Jowett, whose temper, like his face, is a gleam of classic Greek sunshine, such as of old opened the sweet and fragrant flowers for the Attic bees to sip, seems to have given up theology for literature, and gone from the exposition of St. Paul to the interpretation of Plato, a task far better suited to his temper and genius. The present tendency of the active liberal thought of England seems to me to be more and more positively Christian, and to place more reliance upon the objective facts of Christ's personality and the New Testament record. I saw Dean Stanley several times, both in London and in Rome, and had a good deal of conversation with him; and, although he is more conspicuous for power as a scholar and historian than as a philosopher or theologian, he impressed me much by his affirmation of the positive meaning and force of Christianity, and his utter unwillingness to give up the positive gospel and the divine Christ for any form or fellowship of free religion. The article that he recently contributed to "Macmillan's Magazine" on the "Transfiguration" is in the vein of his conversation with me; and, whilst his church views are more based upon national order than upon ecclesiastical authority and sacramental grace, his Christian convictions are not of the Erastian pattern, but come from a source beyond English laws or Roman decrees. He rejoiced greatly in the appointment of Dr. Temple to the See of Exeter, but he repudiated the idea that his influence as a bishop would be turned in any way to the hurt of positive Christianity. I judged that what is called the Broad Church in England was gaining in true breadth, and not content with the scholarly culture which had been its conspicuous ornament. Dr. Temple's departure from Rugby surely did not indicate any lax views of religion, for he parted from his boys, not with a rationalist essay in praise of general free thinking upon his lips, but with prayer at the communion table, to which scores of fine young

fellows thronged with tears in their eyes, all eager to take the sacred memorials from his own cherished hands.

An American traveler cannot but be impressed by the remarkable absence, or at least infrequency, of polemic theological discussion in Europe. I met with little of it in my tour, and Dr. E. A. Park of Andover, who traveled more through Germany than I, said that he was surprised to find so little of theological controversy there. The church questions are everywhere discussed, indeed, and almost everywhere there is a great deal of interest in the subject of the relation of modern thought to the Scriptures and the church. I found little agitation of the points at issue between our American Unitarians and Trinitarians, and in fact there seemed to be little disposition among well-informed persons to divide upon these points; for it is the general habit of Christians to believe that God is one being, and that within this unity there is a foundation for that plurality of relations which are expressed in the Christian revelation as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. I found no theologian who denied the unity of God, and none either who denied that there is a great truth in what is usually called the Trinity. I was more impressed by the learning and depth of Dorner of Berlin than by any other European theologian; and it was his conviction, if I rightly understood him, that God is one absolute being in three relations, not merely of manifestation, but of existence; and that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are distinctions, not merely of manifestation in time, but of essential modes in his eternal being. Rothe, who died before I went abroad, has left on record his views much to the same effect, although he explicitly states his dissent from the common doctrine of the Trinity, and tries to shun Sabellianism, perhaps without success, by limiting the Trinity to the modes of revelation, and the Unity to the essential being of God, and regarding the Father as God transcendent, and the Son as God immanent, and the Spirit as the animating life from their unity. I am not now discussing the doctrine of the Trinity, but merely illustrating the tendency of modern thought to interpret this doctrine. Evidently the study of the universe in its

unity and its variety leads enlightened thinkers, as it led Swedenborg, to seek in the Divine Nature itself something to correspond to the unity and variety of creation. It is evident that modern science delights to trace out the parallel, and find in the analysis of every drop of water and every ray of light a witness from the primeval hand that made all things to confirm the baptismal commission and the apostolic benediction in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The commentator on the New Testament takes the other course, and reasons from revelation to nature instead of from nature to revelation, and both are coming signally together under the guidance of our modern mind.

In a certain way what is called the Positivist philosophy is telling upon the study of the Christian religion; and it is becoming common now to insist, as Keim so forcibly urges, upon taking our ideas from facts according to the scientific method, instead of following the old theology and taking our facts from preconceived ideas. My impression is, that the most enlightened theologians now are eminent for their modest deference to the facts of nature, history, the human soul, and God's kingdom, whilst infidelity is more given to speculation, and theorizes in the wildest way about the universe of matter and the records of revelation and the whole providence of God. Such theorists as Strauss and Baur have had their quietus from a very modest and careful school of students of the facts of the case; and such men as Keim of Zurich in his *Life of Jesus of Nazareth*, and Hausrath of Heidelberg on the *Age of Jesus*, with all their imperfections, are throwing new light upon the New-Testament record by a rigid study of all the memorials of the primitive Christian times. I tried to give the substance of Keim's first volume in the "Christian Examiner" of May last year, and was disappointed in not finding him at home in Zurich in September. Any one who wishes to get at the marrow of Hausrath's able book may find it in the outline of sixty-eight pages in the first number of the "*Compte Rendu*" of Geneva for the present year. Such careful studies of the facts of Christ's history bring him nearer to us as a living person-

ality, and, when taken in connection with the higher criticism of which I have already spoken, do much to enlarge our knowledge, refresh our faith, and save us from the folly and ingratitude of calling this nineteenth century the age of materialism and unbelief. The Greeks may have invaded Christendom and brought their sharp light to bear upon the ancient beliefs, but the word which called light into being of old need not fear any new brightness ; and thus far in history the word that was incarnate in our Lord has not lost, but gained, by every age of true illumination.

We may be too much of a critical, talking, and writing generation, so busy with discussing the doctrine as to slight doing the commandment with ready and strong will ; yet it is comforting to find the modern spirit so mindful of the power elements of Christianity, and so much interested in tracing true moral force and virtue to its spring in God's word and spirit and in Christ's grace. A few words upon the bearings of the free and rational modern mind as to the highest morality or the true ethics. "Conscience" is a great word in our time, and is thought by a large class of persons to supersede positive and historical Christianity by establishing an independent tribunal in every soul without need of any help except proper instruction upon what our duties are, a matter in which we may take counsel of all teachers, and of Jesus, the great teacher, among the number. Some of the scientific moralists, such as John Stuart Mill, however, quarrel with the moral precepts of Jesus, and blame the New Testament for the lack of manly pluck in its temper, and for urging submission so often where stern defiance would be true heroism. But I do not see that the great philosophical moralists of our time are troubled with any such sense of defect in Christianity ; but, on the other hand, they value the gospel, not so much for the code of specific duties which it teaches, as for the heroic will, the manly and godly virtue that it breathes. In Germany the most memorable schools of ethics take their stand on this principle. The two master moralists of Berlin and Heidelberg begin their science of ethics with God as the perfect good, derive all true

virtue from his manifestation in men, especially through Christ, and regard specific duties but as the paths in which the virtues must fitly walk. Rothe's great work on ethics within a year or two has been taken out of its hiding place in the libraries of a few scholars, and interpreted and illustrated in all Christendom; and he who was chosen first of all to represent the modern culture of this nineteenth century at the opening of the famous Protestant union finds the soul of all manhood in God and Christ, and in his own brave and gentle life he exemplified the doctrine that he taught. I heard that he had left his evangelical position, and been carried away by Schenkel into radical extravagance and political agitation, and I asked Dorner if it was so. He said that he knew Rothe well, and he was his friend to the last, and that he died, as he lived, in full Christian faith, with Christ for his hope and strength. Schenkel, a strong, manly character, but with too much of the newspaper writer and less than once of the calm theologian in his composition, is sacredly preserving and printing all of his great master's remains; and not only Christian devotees, but thoughtful persons of all classes, will be wiser for the treasures thus secured. His work on "Theologic Ethics" is pre-eminently a modern book, in some respects as free as any ethical treatise of our day, as in its views of the theatre and all the beautiful arts; yet it is thoroughly Christian, and in its pages we find the witness of those early Christian ages repeated which saw the spirit of Plato and Aristotle pass into the Christian church, and brought the Greek mind to the faith of the gospel.

In England, the new ethics shows something of the same tendency, and the utilitarianism of Paley and Bentham has yielded to far nobler teaching. I was surprised to find, even among the best representatives of the ritual party, such emphasis laid upon positive Christianity as the spring of true force; and such men as T. T. Carter, in sermons of great power as well as of frequent beauty, urged meditation, prayer, and obedience, not merely as duties to be done, but as means of fellowship with God and partaking of his Almighty Spirit. In quite another way the evangelicals affirmed

the same doctrine, and the leader of the Independents, Mr. Binney, wins notice by his generous doctrine of Christian virtue, which he declares to be as essential for true life here as for salvation hereafter. The English liberals of the many and various kinds, with various degrees of illumination, seemed to me to emphasize strongly the Christian elements of morality; and such masters as Maurice, in his last work on ethics, and Martineau, in his memorable address of May, 1869, presented conscience in its vital relations with God and the gospel. We ought not to wonder that there are some writers and thinkers who ignore and disparage the connection between duty and faith, and make virtue to be the work of self-culture, and duty the result of individual intuition. They undoubtedly have their place and help in the great work of bringing out the real moral powers of our nature, and in the end showing the capacity as well as our need of Christian fellowship and divine grace. Fichte, and his followers in our time, everywhere help faith in the end by showing the nobleness and also the dreariness of trying to lift themselves by themselves; and the whole school of transcendental moralists are preparing the way for the broad and blessed ethics of Christianity in its ground of faith and springs of power.

I have no time to go into the church question which is now earnestly agitated all over Christendom, or to describe the various points at issue between the modern spirit and church dignitaries and institutions. I must say, however, that Europe gave me a far greater idea of the power and the perseverance of the clergy and the church than I had before. Everywhere you see the monuments of positive Christian faith; and temples, worship, charities, schools, colleges, bear unmistakably the mark of the cross. If in many respects the new spirit of free and equal co-operation, which is such a feature of modern life, wars against the old church ways, in other respects it has revealed itself in them, and some of the most effective co-operative associations of our time are undoubtedly Christian, and look to Christ as their head, and to his ministers as their helpers. The Christian Associations so

well known among us are found in many forms in Europe, and a traveler is surprised to see how much of the voluntary co-operative spirit is cherished even by the Roman Catholic clergy, and what numerous and powerful sodalities and unions they are organizing everywhere. Germany, notwithstanding its stubborn individualism, is showing the same disposition even in Protestant quarters, and in home missions, hospitals, and other charities, winning free will and work to Christian faith. Some of these movements illustrate the woman's head, or the Greek medallion, that I spoke of at the outset; and such establishments as the Bethany at Berlin, with its fine church, and hospital of three hundred beds and forty deaconesses in charge, are good proof that woman's better day is coming, and she is to have her part in the new life. In conservative England the co-operative principle is favored by many prominent clergymen, and persons as wide apart as Maurice, the broad churchman, and Benson, the ritualist, are engaged in schemes for making numbers work together for their mutual good.

Undoubtedly much of the new policy of co-operation cares little for religion and less for the church, and thinks mainly of wresting the mastery from the close fist of capital and giving labor its rights, or of dethroning kings and priests, and inaugurating the rule of the people as sole priesthood and lord. Yet the drift that way is less violent than once, and thoughtful men, in all classes, are asking for themselves and their families the comfort and power of a strong and generous institutional religion. Within forty years surely the English Church has gained much upon the affections of the people, and Mr. Gladstone himself, alike in his church devotion and his liberal statesmanship, is a good representative of what is most hopeful in his communion; and if the best promise of the past is fulfilled, in twenty or thirty years the English Church, whether disestablished or not, will be more than now within the affections of Englishmen by welcoming all Christian people to its altars and by preaching worth of the majesty and unction of its worship.

I will not venture to predict how the battles of the rival

churches in Europe or America are to be settled, but it is clear that the work of disintegration has about reached its end, and the work of reconstruction is going on. Christendom is weary of sects and asking how to bring her scattered members together. All the raging feuds in the Episcopal Church have not separated the disputants from the common rule, and there is little prospect of the Roman Catholic Council ending in any open schism, however true it may be that a powerful protest will be made against the new dogma, and a free Catholic fellowship will be formed within the papal jurisdiction, such as will in time tell upon Christendom. What we ought to wish is, that when the great reconstruction comes, all vital elements of truth and goodness shall be welcome; no true and pure life shall be destroyed, but all that is humane and godly shall live anew in more freedom, faith, and communion. Perhaps before this century closes and thirty years pass, we shall see with astonishment the mighty evolution of the mission of our age in the reconstruction of order upon the basis of liberty; and we shall bless all the prophets, apostles, lawgivers, poets, and leaders who have helped on its august work. We shall rejoice in men who, like Channing, have stood up manfully for the worth of the individual soul, and in men like Spurgeon and Beecher, who have won the common sense of the free people to religion and shown the power of congregational fellowship, whilst we shall none the less honor those calm and far-seeing sages of the old and new times, who have found in the New Testament an order of church polity for Christendom, and believed that each soul is freest when true to the law that calls all to God and his Christ in one faith and one baptism. The caucus and the counting-room may try to govern churches, and capricious and ignorant committees may, for a time, hire and dismiss preachers, as if religion were mere business, and the penny were the protoplasm at the base of all Christian organization; but the true modern spirit accepts spiritual laws, discerns between kinds of service and degrees of bulk, and will not confound the church with the world, nor put the minister of religion at the mercy of political cabals or financial cliques.

We are to have the Church of Christ with its preachers and pastors, and the freest inspiration moves in the path of its truths and breathes in the atmosphere of its spirit.

To-morrow is Whitsunday, and I cannot forget that a year ago last Sunday evening, one of the freshest of modern scholars, Dean Stanley, said to me, that he believed that Whitsunday was to be the great festival of the Church of the Future. If so, as it indeed may be, must not the free spirit live within the old institution, and the New Testament, upon which you so bravely take your stand, be newer than ever by opening into a brave and gentle life, at once trusting and progressive, personal and social, instead of remaining an ancient record, too sacred to be handled freely and cleared from time-honored dust? Without waiting for the remote future, or dreaming of what may be said or written or sung on Whitsunday in the year 1900, we may well rejoice in what Christendom to-morrow will do, and in the voices of the Spirit that will speak in every tongue and from every land to the glory of God and for the communion of all his children.

WHEN Alexander the Great passed into Asia, he gave large donations to his captains and men of merit; insomuch that Parmenio asked him, "Sir, what do you keep for yourself?" He answered, "Hope." And John of Alexandria, surnamed the Almoner, did use yearly to make even with his revenues, and when he had distributed all to the poor, he thanked God that he had now nothing left him but his Lord and Master Christ Jesus, to whom he longed to fly with unlimed and untangled wings. Thus we can want nothing if we want not Christ. He is the good man's chief portion (LAM. iii. 24). Crosses, calamities, poverty, may take from us all the goods of this world, or our charity may give them away: the worldlings ask us what we have left for ourselves; we answer, Only Jesus Christ, and in him we have all things. — *John Spencer.*

JESUS.

THEY may be right who say 'tis best
To let the mystic Jesus rest, —
The Jesus whom men deified,
The God who wept and bled and died.

BUT him, our gracious human friend,
We'll keep till time itself shall end ;
That sacred and beloved face
Shall never vanish from our race !

O brothers ! think whate'er you may
About his name or place to-day,
But only love him : we are one,
And naught shall part us 'neath the sun.

YOU love him now ; your works do tell
That you have proved his gospel well, —
His golden key, which found the art
To reach the mighty Father's heart.

AND some of us will ever gaze
Upon his human looks and ways,
And some of us may think divine
The love which from those eyes did shine.

BUT we shall all possess our friend, —
His being we shall comprehend,
In every varying light and shade,
Till we are in his likeness made.

THAT glorious likeness each shall find,
To suit the yearning of his mind,
And own him king, with loyal breath,
Who was our servant unto death.

MARTHA P. LOWE.

"THE DEMAND."

BY R. P. STEBBINS, D.D.

IN the February number of this Review "The Situation" of the Unitarian denomination was stated with the clearness and candor which the gravity of the subject demands. Probably very few will dissent from the view there taken. It was a very delicate and difficult undertaking to be frank and charitable and true, and yet escape giving serious offense. While the author lamented the results of the rash and destructive criticism and philosophy now become so popular, he did not counsel neglect of criticism nor proclaim that no more light was to shine out of the Bible, that no more advance would be made in Christian theology. A Unitarian is necessarily progressive. There is not a Unitarian in the ministry, or out of it probably, who is not looking for more truth as well as longing for it. In this, perhaps, all who call themselves Unitarians are agreed. And furthermore, they are agreed that no obstacle shall be laid in the way of the largest possible freedom of inquiry and belief. It is therefore simple folly to say that a portion of the Unitarians are not progressive, not hungering and thirsting after more truth, because they do not follow the same leaders, reach the same conclusions, and maintain the same opinions as another portion of them do. This assumption of superior love of truth, of greater candor in investigation, of greater scholarship, and greater spirituality, which is not seldom made by radical writers and speakers, is getting to be as stale and offensive as it is groundless.

We do not say that this representation does not seem to be truth to those who utter it. It is wonderful how a mistake, an error, can be made to appear to be truth to one's own mind and to other minds by its frequent and confident and uncontradicted repetition. Such persons, unquestionably, think that all wisdom, and all learning, and all ardor of inquiry, and all love of discovery, and all freedom of investi-

gation, are with them. The opinion touches the soundness of their judgment, not their integrity. The churches, especially the younger members of them, have been led to believe by this constant iteration that we of the older school were not willing to investigate the new questions of the day, were indisposed to grapple with the new difficulties which are found in the way of the longer acceptance of the old opinions, and were rather desirous of keeping the people ignorant of the new light which modern researches in antiquities and philology are throwing upon the historical and doctrinal interpretation of the Bible.

We have not a word to say, and never have said a word, in opposition to the largest liberty of inquiry, the tenderest consideration of those from whom we differ, however wild and injurious their opinions may appear to us. We advocate, with all the ardor of our heart, and all the fervor of our love of truth, the utmost freedom of thought and speech and pen. We assert for ourselves the largest possible liberty of investigation, of publication, of association, of organization; and while life and health remain we will vindicate them for all others with all our mind and strength. We hold, as we hold to life, the *equal* right of all.

Those persons who have expressed a desire for a new association or fraternity of Unitarian Christians have never said one word, or done one thing, or proposed to do it, which in the remotest degree abridges the freedom, or discourages the labor, of investigation. Nothing has been proposed or dreamed of detrimental to the largest charity, the tenderest sympathy. The most comprehensive Christian charity does not require us to conceal our own opinions, or to utter them timidly, lest some brethren should allow themselves to be annoyed because their affirmations were contradicted and their claims challenged.

The first "demand" is, that the position, views, and purposes of different classes of Unitarians should be understood and regarded.

The second is this: If we would have any success as a body of Christians, we must banish the delusion that any

efficient work can be done by those who are not agreed either about the work to be done, or how to do it. There can be no co-operation any further than there is agreement. And it is nothing less than folly to talk about doing Christian work and letting Christian belief alone; for all *Christian* work is based on Christian belief — is its out-going. There is a vast deal of dust raised about this very simple matter, and many honest people are blinded by it. It is dinned in our ears from some quarters, and the echoes would lead one uninitiated to think from *all* quarters, that it is no matter what a man believes, provided only he will work. Now it happens that it is of very great consequence what one believes about the work he is going to do if he would succeed in it. If he believes that it is of no importance whether the work is done at all or not, or if he does not believe it should be well done if attempted, or if he does not believe he will succeed in it if he undertakes it, a very different kind of work will be done from that which will be accomplished if he believes with his whole heart and soul that the work is necessary, and must be done, that it is practicable and can be done, and that he himself is strong enough to do it. It makes a world-wide difference what a man believes respecting a work which he has in hand. He may believe or disbelieve what he pleases about the productiveness of the soil on the planet Saturn; but he cannot be indifferent to the adjoining field which he is proposing to sow to wheat.

So a church cannot be indifferent, when it enters upon a Christian work, respecting the importance, the value, of that work. If Christianity is no longer a vital force, why be in earnest to do its work? Why labor to prop up an effete system? And if those who are going to work together are not agreed respecting the nature of the work, they will not "work with a will." The faithless will weaken the arm of the confident; the distrustful will discourage those who are satisfied. There must be the fervor of confidence and unity "all along the line." A church, in which there is not a large degree of unity, is weak as water for all organized action. There must be unity of belief on the object to be promoted; there

must be harmony of opinion on the way to promote it. A church is an organized body, and unless of one mind and one will on all the great subjects which challenge its strength and labor, it will make but miserably poor work in its endeavors to promote them. The poor victim of St. Vitus' dance would be graceful in his movements by the side of such a halting, hesitating, jerking church.

This terror of being called bigoted — which some are trembling before — because they will not admit everybody into their organization, however repugnant in their belief and acts to their own great aims and purposes and labors, is unworthy a Christian church, and depletes it of its strength. A church should be composed of those and those only who are agreed as to the great things which the church shall do and how it shall do them. Otherwise nothing will be done but quarreling. This exclusion is not based upon the unchristian character of others, but upon a difference of views respecting the Christian work they will undertake, and respecting also the best method of doing it. There is no bigotry in this. It is simple common sense applied to church organization and action.

In the good providence of God the field is ample for workers of every sort. It is not necessary to try the experiment of making all plow, or all reap, or all dig drains. There is a proverb which has not yet lost its force, that "many a good carpenter has been spoiled to make a poor minister." So many a good organization and church have been spoiled by trying to be everything, and becoming thereby nothing but a laughing stock. The more united the church is, the more efficient it is. The greater the diversity of feeling and opinion the more helpless it is, the less force it has, the less work it can do.

But how is it with us? What is the doctrine proclaimed upon the house-tops with all the earnestness of desperation? Why, that belief is of no particular consequence; that work is what the world wants. Just as if a man should shout at the top of his voice, "Water is of no consequence, we want the fire put out; timber is of no consequence, we want houses;

wheat is of no consequence, we want bread." I once heard a young preacher say that when he commenced preaching he had nothing to say. He believed but little, and that little he did not believe much. He was right. How could he preach when he did not believe? He has come to believe something and he lifts up his voice like a trumpet; he cries aloud; he spares not; he shows the exceeding sinfulness of sin and the surpassing beauty of goodness unto men, in season and out of season. Such is the difference between believing and non-believing.

The church, then, must be full of faith; must have a clear and fixed belief in all the vital elements of Christianity. This must underlie all church organization and action, as the everlasting rock underlies the mountain. Instead of reducing belief to the minimum in the delusive hope of thereby gaining strength, it should be raised to the maximum in the assurance that the broader the foundation the firmer the superstructure. A pyramid on its apex is as large, it is true, as when it is on its base, but it is not so stable. No! fill up the head with beliefs, warmed and vitalized by an earnest heart, and then the church will have power and stability, and not be driven hither and thither by every wind of doctrine, nor allured hither and thither by every freak of fancy.

The demand is great and pressing for a clear doctrinal belief in our churches. The general confession, that we will "try to be good," is not sufficient to sustain an efficient church organization. I do not mean that these doctrines or beliefs should refer to the *philosophy* of the Christian religion, but to its *facts*,—as, that the Gospels contain a record of the teachings and works of Jesus Christ; that what Jesus has taught is true, and is to be obeyed if a command, and trusted if a promise; that he is, therefore, our Lord and Master, and his teachings are the *supreme and final rule of faith and practice to all his disciples*. General affirmations of this kind distinguishing a Christian from a deist must be made, or, in these days when attempts are made to remove all the landmarks of Christianity, we shall have churches of Christ, so called, with no Christians in them, and preachers of Christ,

so called, the burden of whose message is denial of both his authority and leadership. All efforts to sustain and spread Christianity will be balked and thwarted by members calling themselves Christians, but not accepting the authority, the Lordship, of Christ.

When the church has broken away from these delusions that all wisdom and learning are with those who have been foremost to claim it, and that belief is of no importance, that work is the great thing, one more step remains to be taken: the work of the church is to be entered upon. And it can be entered upon now intelligently, and therefore effectively. It is understood what the church chooses as its special work in the great vineyard of the Master, and it goes about it with the steadiness, the assurance, the persistency, the irresistibility of destiny.

But what is there, many of our churches may ask, for us to do? It is not wonderful that some of our churches should ask this question. Their temporal affairs are perfected, apparently. Church, lecture-room, parsonage, are all in good Christian condition. There is nothing shabby or negligent about them: a pleasant sight to the eye. The financial affairs of the society are as well managed as those of a bank. The pew-rents and taxes or subscriptions are paid promptly. Before twelve o'clock of the day on which the minister's quarter salary is due the faithful treasurer is at the door of the parsonage with a check or roll of bills "in payment of the contract, not for the service rendered," — this he is kind hearted enough to say to the minister. Well, admirable, worthy of a Christian society, when some societies are as slovenly in their care of their church property as they are slack and grudging in the payment of the miserable dole which they promise their minister! But of this well-to-do church, may I ask something of its spiritual gifts, its personal offerings, unto the Lord? Are you as prompt in your attendance at church as you are in the payment of your subscription or pew-rent? Do you not permit a storm or a slight indisposition to keep you at home? The influence on a congregation, when all have made a special effort to attend church on stormy or

otherwise unpleasant days, is electrical. It is sermon, singing, and prayer. Every one feels kindled, wrapt, translated almost. Would that our churches understood the power of united, persistent church-going! People have no idea of the spirit, the fervor, the fire, it imparts to a preacher to see them throng the church. It demands effort, and sometimes hard and self-denying effort, to attend church regularly, the whole congregation filling all the pews Sunday after Sunday. And till this is done no congregation need inquire what there is for them to do. Fill your pews every Sunday without fail, remembering to take the little ones with you. This is the first work, and a great work for every church to do. It is no Christian work to give a hundred or a thousand dollars to build a church in Minnesota, and not attend the services in your own. The great work for any church to do is to conscientiously and constantly attend the services of the church. The carelessness, the apparently utter indifference of a large part of a congregation to attendance on the regular services of the church are painful, and can be commuted by no generous subscriptions to charities. Men, if not women, can attend church in any weather which does not prevent the minister from attending. And it seems as if a man who had the feelings and the heart of a man would be ashamed to send his minister through the storm to preach to empty pews. He would be ashamed if there were any shame in him.

Do you ask, then, what your congregation can do? I answer, you can do a *very great work*; go to church, every one of you, from January to January with warm hearts through winter's snows, with hot brows through summer's heat. This is the first great work. This done, the rest of the special work of the congregation will be easy and the burden light. The Sunday school, all the charitable circles and social circles, will prosper.

But a larger field of work opens which can be done only by uniting your labors with those of other churches. Churches must form larger organizations as individuals form churches. And the same principle applies to the formation of churches themselves. There must be a basis of belief for any super-

structure of action. Heaps of drift-wood are not dwellings, gatherings of churches are not organizations. No Christian organization can be efficient which is not based on a common faith and purpose. If the basis of the organization is so general as to include everybody, the fruits of the organization will be nothing. And just as the basis of the organization becomes specific will the organization become productive; and the more specific the basis, other things being equal, the more abundant the labors, the more luscious the vintage. If you wish to collect a multitude, let the trumpets give an uncertain sound; but if you wish for heroes girded for battle, let its blast be as intelligible as the first commandment. In this the National Conference is lame. Its basis of faith is too general, and the amendments have reduced its first confession to an infinitesimal, and finally to nothing. No efficient action can be taken by such a body in the promotion of anything but the human, the philanthropic side of Christianity; and that action will be taken, not necessarily, because it is Christian from the teaching of the Master, but because it is human, a prompting of human sympathy of which the deist partakes as well as the Christian. The churches need a platform which is distinctively and emphatically *Christian*, — Christian past the *possibility* of challenge. The work to be done should be distinctly and specifically stated. Then each church will feel confidence in joining it and acting with it, and will feel that its funds will go for the promotion of the object stated, and not be scattered over all sorts of experiments, and lavished in support of organizations and preachers who are careful to come to Jesus, if they come to him at all, by night — some of whom even betray him, denying his authority; and sometimes, though not denying his honesty, deploring his delusion.

The churches wish to know what their money is going for, and then they will give joyfully and abundantly. The amount contributed by the churches to the funds of the American Unitarian Association is much smaller than it would be if they were assured that their contributions would not be given for the support of men and churches whose doctrines

they look upon as destructive, not only to all which they hold dear, but also to all which distinguishes Christianity from deism, Christ from Socrates. In his endeavor to conciliate, our excellent Secretary, whom all love and confide in, is unintentionally betrayed into ambiguity of speech.

Sometimes one would judge from his speeches that the Association intended to sustain *all* men and *all* enterprises *calling themselves Unitarian*; that all churches would be aided, and all preachers sustained in founding churches, provided only *they took upon themselves* the name of Unitarian. At other times one would judge the opposite; that discrimination would be made between those who acknowledged the supremacy and authority of the teachings of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and those who deny or ignore both. So the churches do not give with their whole heart and work with their whole will. And while a doubt as important as this rests on the churches it will continue to be so.

We need, therefore, an organization of those churches which shall be above suspicion, and unequivocally planted on the rock Christ Jesus. Rev. A. P. Putnam, of Brooklyn, N.Y., states our need in this respect in the "Liberal Christian," Feb. 26, with force and candor. He says there is a call "for the organization of those . . . who plant themselves squarely on the New Testament as the one grand rule of faith and practice. As things are now all is confusion and unrest." And this organization, we add in his spirit, should not be made—if made at all—for the purpose of battling or opposing other organizations of any kind, local or national, but for the *sole* purpose of enabling the churches so organized to do or help do their Master's work understandingly, and even cheerfully, ardently, efficiently, without doubt, hesitancy, or timidity, so that gifts may heap the altar, and their beneficence flow forth, refreshing as the stream seen by the prophet issuing from the throne of God.

Such an organization would not, necessarily, collect funds into its own treasury. Indeed, it may not have any general treasury any more than the National Conference. It may only encourage the American Unitarian Association to plant

itself, past all suspicion or challenge, on the *Christian* platform, and thus remove all the present doubts of the churches which so choke the streams of their beneficence. It might be a most efficient aid to the Association, as the National Conference proposed to be, and would have been had it not first embraced "other Christian Churches," and then committee *felo de se*. If this co-operation is declined on this *distinctly announced* Christian basis, then it will be time, and not till then, to determine what further, if anything, should be done to render the organization an efficient worker in spreading pure and undefiled religion.

We wish to meet and work for Christianity without the everlasting, irrepressible question being raised of whether, indeed, there be any Christianity; and if there be, whether it is not outgrown, imbecile, obstructive to human progress. We believe, devoutly, heartily, unreservedly; and we wish to meet in Christian work those of like precious Christian faith or none. Then we can call upon the churches to give, and they will give abundantly; their hearts, their prayers, going with their gifts and sanctifying them. There are churches enough of this faith and spirit ready to contribute a hundred thousand dollars, if needed, to spread their faith in destitute places. We feel sure from what we know of these churches which now halt, and hesitate, and distrust, that we could collect the amount named without serious difficulty on the conditions specified above. We cannot have mistaken the sentiments we have heard expressed on this subject. We cannot have mistaken, nor can so many others well situated to interpret them have mistaken, the signs of the times. Even from the West, from which those who are not acquainted with the state of feeling and opinion there would have least expected it, comes the trumpet note of Dr. Robert Laird Collier calling to the standard. He insists that the proposed organization or the American Unitarian Association should distinctly proclaim that it "will not employ any man as a missionary who does not sincerely accept historic Christianity, the headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the value and sanctity of the Christian sacraments," And there

is no doubt but that Dr. Collier would say the same of the societies established and the books circulated. It is time to have it understood that Sunday lyceums, under the name of "Liberal societies for the promotion of love to God and love to man," are not Christian churches. Christ is named in many of them only to be disowned and denied by the spirits, for a time liberated from prison, that "peep and mutter," or to be discarded by a philosophy born of the earth and doomed to the grave.

It is to be hoped that the American Unitarian Association will, through its executive committee, present a statement of its basis of action which will remove forever every possibility of doubt in regard to its policy from these hesitating, doubting churches. If it is such as they cannot accept, very well; it had better, infinitely better, be known than suspected. Open, frank action is the only Christian, as well as the only manly, action. There is strength in confidence though numbers may be few; there is weakness in distrust though the host may be innumerable. A statement was made of the basis of action, the ground of policy of the Association, several years ago, which has fallen out of sight as well as out of regard, though it has never been rescinded. It is high time there was another statement made. In behalf of thousands in our churches, and friends of the Association, though sometimes, it must be confessed, surprised ones, we ask that a definite line of policy, in some direction, be announced. Then the churches will know just what to expect, will be startled by no surprises, will trouble it with no complaints.

This organization of common faith, labor, and sympathy, or this declaration of the Unitarian Association, or both, the churches by scores are waiting for and yearning for and praying for; and the first, at least, cannot be long delayed.

These "Demands" being answered, then the "Pentecostal gales" will again sweep through and fill all our churches. Every instrument and agency of this and of other organizations will be pervaded by the spirit of the living God, as the "spirit of the living creatures" pervaded and vitalized the

wheels of the throne of the Invisible seen by Ezekiel in vision. Criticism will give place to assent ; distrust to confidence ; debate to devotion ; hesitancy to zeal ; indifference to earnestness ; denial to confession ; suspicion to consecration ; with clasped hands, and warm hearts, and firm step, the churches will move forward to victory. May the God of all grace and consolation hasten the hour of their triumph !

WHEN a wealthy merchant bragged to Lycon, a wise philosopher, of the multitude of his great ships and furniture for sea, being able to trade in all parts, the wise man made this answer : " I esteem not that to be felicity which hangs upon ropes and cables." Thus, when a man is at the last cast, it is piety and the true fear of God, not plenty and prosperity (which are transitory), that shall stand a man in stead : the smoke of a great man's sacrifice smells never the sweeter before God because he is clothed in silk, or, like the bird of paradise, adorned with plumes and fine feathers ; no, it is the inside that God regards. He looks on man's obedience, requires his service, loves his thankfulness, respects his holiness, and will reward his faithfulness. — *John Spencer.*

HOMER, in his Iliad, hath appointed unto dreams two doors, the one a door of horn, which was the door of truth ; the other a door of ivory, which was the door of deceit. For horn (as they say) may be looked through ; but ivory being thick and dark is not transparent. These doors may very well be applied to the mouths of men, which are as the indexes and tables of the heart ; for to some it is a door of glass, which is soon broken open, and easily giveth pass to a multitude of words, wherein the folly of their hearts and minds is concerned ; to others it is a door of brass, firm and solid in keeping in their words with more care and circumspection, and showing the firm solidity of their hearts and minds. — *John Spencer.*

THE DUTY OF RELIGIOUS PROFESSION, IN SOME OF ITS ASPECTS.

BY REV. J. H. WIGGIN.

WHO forgets the interview of Jesus with the Samaritan woman at the well? The Master then sowed the seed of true religion in Sychar. The woman's conscience responded to his appeal. She was converted to better purposes. Not only so, but she led others to the Teacher, and he departed, leaving behind him an improved moral soil.

Two years later, when Christians were scattered by the persecution at Jerusalem, Philip threw aside Jewish prejudices and went to the chief city of Samaria to preach. This Philip was neither an apostle, elder, nor bishop; only a plain deacon, one of the seven appointed "to serve tables" in the charities of the Jerusalem church; but he preached the same gospel. The good seed before planted sprang to the surface with this new watering, and God gave the increase. Philip was not long in that region, but men and women "believed the things which he preached concerning the kingdom of God and Jesus Christ, and were baptized;" that is, they made public profession of religion, and a church was organized.

The fastidious may deem this action too hasty, yet it is but one among many similar occurrences narrated in the Book of Acts. Gospel preaching was everywhere followed by belief, repentance, conversion, *profession*.

The more closely one contemplates the interdependence of mankind, and the keener the insight into human nature, the more profound must be the conviction that open profession, following conversion, was not an apostolic freak, nor an accommodation by Jesus to the spirit of the age; has not been maintained in the church through fashion or superstition alone; is not a divine concession to weak people: but a lasting provision of God for the spread of his Church and the salvation of his souls.

A few homely suggestions in regard to this duty are here submitted to those readers who have not yet committed themselves by any open avowal to the Christian church. They are suggestions "of truth and soberness," sanctioned alike by the New Testament and Christian experience.

"Will one sit with us this time who has never done so before?" should be a question with every thoughtful churchman as the communion approaches. To be sure, Unitarians commonly open this sacrament, as Jesus opened the kingdom of heaven, to all believers; but rarely does one come to it without first uniting with the church, though God forbid that any one should *limit* church-membership to the reception of the Lord's Supper.

"*Ought we to profess religion if we have it not?*" This is a question often asked by the doubting. "No!" must be the response. But who professes *irreligion*? Many are only *un-religious* at the worst. In every parish there are of honorable, devout, godly, religious men and women, not a few, who believe in Jesus Christ and God's kingdom like those at Sychar, and ought to make the same distinct profession.

I. *Such a profession is a duty to the family.*

Children know whether parents are or are not religious; whether they go to church only, or belong there; whether they pray with them; whether they enjoy the sacraments, or turn therefrom, as "aliens to the covenant of promise and strangers in the commonwealth of Israel." Children love their fathers and mothers and think them about right. They criticise not. They even marvel that others regard observances which their parents shun. But children note the lack of religious profession. Eventually they may sorely regret the omission. Should they take this step themselves, they will wish it shared. Children dislike to seem more religious than their parents, and many a young man or maiden is hindered in profession by the coldness of those who ought to lead. Should sons and daughters never profess religion in this life, they will deplore the parental neglect the more in that which is to come.

What care is taken to fit boys and girls for earning an

honest livelihood, to secure them means of support, and confer upon them a better education than their fathers enjoyed! Yet one day other culture will weigh against holy character as "dust in the balances." When the scarlet fever rages, how assiduously we shield our little ones from its contagion, though disease must end with the grave; but the consequences of negligence in religion pass beyond the grave.

"*Better give a good example than make profession,*" is often declared.

By all means; but may not a good profession be included in the example? Because somebody unduly emphasizes profession as a way of salvation, shall it therefore be held of no account? Between profession and example there is no antagonism. Both are parts of life.

The duty extends "to children's children, even unto the third and fourth generation." This fact may be observed: If one generation belongs to the *church*, and the next to the *parish* only, the third is likely to forsake both parish and church. The grandfather is a member. The father is a conscientious parishioner. The son is a lukewarm church-goer. The grandson turns his back alike upon pews and ordinances, unless by some new turn brought into the fold. There are many exceptions, but this is the rule. There is religious momentum enough to tide over the second or third generation, but it spends itself in the fourth. Look about in meeting and see how many of the attendants are either church members or the children of church members. Consider, also, if the empty pews belong not to those whose parents were simply parishioners. In illustration of this: on a recent stormy Sunday, the communion was unexpectedly administered. The congregation was small, but the communicants as numerous as usual; proving that those who composed the rainy-day audience were professed adherents. Here is a householder who seldom misses a sermon. If he makes no farther profession, the chances are that the children he now sends to Sunday school will miss the church altogether. Is it desirable that they should stand even where the

parents now are,—let those parents take the higher position and so transmit the covenant to posterity.

II. *Religious profession is a duty to the ministry.*

A pastor is employed to lead or assist in the Christianization of the community, and not merely to preach sermons. He must see the results. He can make no man religious without that man's active co-operation. Neither can he reach outsiders if those who are supposed to be most interested stand aloof. Let the minister be met more than half way.

It may be said that a true man will wait for the results in heaven; but Jesus came to establish heaven on earth. Heaven is where the results of the gospel are. The farmer takes thought for his farm years ahead, yet he is grievously disappointed if there be not a harvest year by year. So it is with the preacher and his parish.

Said a good woman, "One pastor went away disheartened. Another came. Straightway several persons joined the church. But they only carried out impulses received from his predecessor." Aye? And why not encourage the man who had thus wrought in them by taking that step during *his* pastorate?

III. *Religious profession is a duty to the parish.*

Though not the highest duty, this is important. Nothing so aids the business of a society as honest profession of religion. Young men and women, taking this stand, help the parish more than they know, and make it additionally attractive even to those who fancy themselves radically opposed to profession. The ungodly invariably flock to those churches where the most godly people are to be found.

Commonly it is said, that when the husband is orthodox the wife goes with him; but if the wife is orthodox the husband goes with her. In either case, evangelicism, so called, carries the day. Why so? Here is the answer in two real cases. A young citizen marries a Unitarian scholar. He argues thus: "Husband and wife should attend church together. If one is a member and the other not, the other should yield. I belong and you do not. Come with me." A middle-aged Unitarian man weds an active Presbyterian.

She uses the same reasoning: "You are not a professor; I am: go with me!" And why not? If one has thus proved more interest in his or her preferred form of religion, such courage deserves to win. Even those who regret the change consent that the position is well taken, and so it is. Now it is obvious that if the Unitarian parochial atmosphere were favorable to religious profession, such logic would be practically parried and such losses not sustained.

The biggest congregation falls to pieces when the preacher fails, unless some brave spirits stand pledged upon a positive religious platform. When does a church with many communicants break up? In northern Massachusetts is a parish that was very dead. To-day its salary is doubled and its pews rent for annual premiums. Why? The story is told in the fact that seventy persons professed religion there at one time. No wonder that the A. society prospers.

At a recent conference, a western pastor related his experience. When he entered his present field of labor, he found everybody profoundly ignorant about the church. He summoned special meetings. A score or two united with the church. "Since that," he concluded, "I know whom to call upon when there is work to be done among the sick or the poor or the young." This experience is not singular. It is, perhaps, the duty of these persons to do as much before as after profession; but "human nature is human nature." The old saw is true: "What is everybody's business is nobody's." People are delicate about putting forth their hands to bear the ark till they are committed by profession. Then they accept their places and fill the parts assigned them. This causes the pitiful fact that our churches so much rely upon workers trained by religious profession in other denominations. If with us there is more religion than profession, in some bodies there is more profession than religion, and both parties would be the better for a change.

IV. *Religious profession is a duty to the church universal.*

This is an aspect of the duty much higher than considerations of mere ecclesiastical success.

The church needs support, moral support as well as material, and even more than material.

Some men think their wives and children ought to be perfectly happy if they have money enough to spend; yet many a woman with sables, camel's hair and Mechlin at command, is less happy than another who never spends fifty dollars a year on herself; and a child showered with gifts is more discontented than children who rarely enjoy a luxury they do not earn. Neither poverty nor wealth confers satisfaction. The heart craves sympathy, friendship, love, life. So the church craves much beside money.

A famous stock gambler is said to support entirely a metropolitan mission. The mission may be useful if its founder lets it severely alone; but what chaplain could counteract such inside influence, unless by first converting his patron?

A minister of another sect declared that once he baptized into the church whereof he was pastor two hundred thousand dollars,—that is, men worth so much property; but he added: "It gave me less satisfaction than the baptism of two young men who were to enter the ministry." For an earnest, cultivated man, devoted to a cause, will in the long run help it more than the unregenerate millionaire, and even bring more funds into its treasury.

A chimney in a dwelling is indispensable for health and comfort; but let the building be destroyed, and the chimney remains an ugly brick pile, to mar the landscape. So money *with* moral strength is everything in the church; *without* it, nothing. Churches rich only in pocket "have a name to live but are dead." Churches rich in spirit manage in some way to thrive.

The expensive pew, the large subscription, the twenty, the hundred, or the thousand dollars per annum, are good and useful; but let a man give the church *himself*, and that is the far greater gift. *Riches* may take wings and fly away; the man is immortal, and will live evermore in the church, militant or triumphant. He who gives himself to the church, thereafter will withhold from her no good thing her honor may demand.

RETRIBUTION.

EVERY MAN SHALL BE AS HAPPY AS HE CAN.

A SERMON. BY ORVILLE DEWEY, D.D.

For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. — JOHN iii. 17.

AMONG the works of Swedenborg is one entitled "Heaven and Hell," in which he undertakes to describe the condition of men in the future life. On the subject of religion in general, I think, and even on this, in some respects, he was singularly in advance of his time. His views of the Christian system as it stands in this world, whether as to its real doctrines or its corruptions, are often admirable; and it is only when he carries us into another that we seem to be walking in fairy land. But, even *then*, we may say of his teaching, or supposed revelation rather, that the *superstructure* is, in many parts, beautiful, and only wants a basis of evidence; his ideas of heaven and hell were not only more rational than those which prevailed in his time, but more rational than those which prevail *now*. The conceptions entertained by many, of heaven as a city of sapphire and gold, and of hell as a lake of fire and brimstone, — merely figurative representations as they evidently are in the Scriptures, — certainly might well be exchanged for Swedenborg's ideas of streams and fountains and green fields and shady groves, amidst which the blessed live, and of dark caves and dismal abodes in which the wicked drearily work out the problem of their earthly errors and aberrations.

There is a feeling in many minds that the law of retribution, the law which holds every soul to a strict account with its faults and errors, is a hard and arbitrary law. It is my purpose in this discourse to show how natural and inevitable that law is; to lead you to consider both what of good and what of ill must be *expected* as the result of our moral action, whether in this or a future life. And the proposition which I lay at the basis of my reasoning upon it is this, that, in regard to all that touches our *spiritual* well-being, every man, in

whatever world he may be, shall be as happy as he can. God is not opposed to his happiness, but infinitely desires it. The system of the universe is not framed to be adverse to his happiness, but favorable to it. God sent his Son into the world, not to make man miserable, but to make him happy. And nothing shall hinder his being happy but himself. His nature, his powers, his faculties, rightly directed and cultivated, are fitted to yield him the highest felicity; and all that he can gain from them he shall have. He shall be as happy as he can.

There is much difficulty felt about the doctrine of retribution, and especially when it is carried into a future life. It is thought to be, in the representations of our own pulpits, a dark and distressful doctrine. I myself have been almost bitterly accused by one of our sister sects of making it very dark and cruel. Let us then look at it in the light of our present statement. Let us ask those who think our doctrine of retribution severe whether they can or, on reflection, would have anything more lenient. And let us in this matter begin at the beginning.

I suppose we are all glad that we exist, that we live, that we have a being. Some troubles, some perils, there are in our existence; but I suppose no one would purchase exemption from them by annihilation. If there be such an one, his case must be left out of our present consideration.

I assume, also, that the nature about which we are to reason must be a rational and moral nature; that, as we would not cease to *be*, so neither would we cease to be *human*. I assume, in other words, that all men, that we ourselves, *would* have, among the elements of our being, something intellectual, something spiritual, something divine; that we are glad that we are capable of reasoning, feeling, remembering, distinguishing right from wrong,—glad that we have ideas, thoughts, satisfactions that rise above sense; that the splendor of the universe is the vision of God, and that the bonds of our nature to one another are love, friendship, and all sacred affinities. No one, I suppose, wishes that he were a horse or a dog. If any one would go and herd with animals, he goes beyond the range of our present contemplation.

I assume, again, that every human being wishes to live hereafter; that no one desires that death should be an eternal sleep. If any one *should* take a ground so extraordinary as to say that he does not care whether he lives hereafter, I would ask him whether he desires to live the next minute. If he says no, I give him the case. But if he says yes, then the same feeling must make him forever desire a continued existence.

If, then, it is granted that all this is desirable, — a being, a moral being, an immortal being, — what is the law under which this existence must begin and proceed and go on forever? In answer, I again express my conviction, that the only law which accords with the divine goodness is, that every being shall be just as happy as he can.

I shall be understood of course, when I say this, to be speaking mainly of what is essential, and not of what is circumstantial; of the nature, and not of its situation; of the pleasure or pain that comes from within, and not from without. I think, indeed, that the former embraces almost the entire good or ill of rational existence; that circumstances mainly take their *character* from the *being* who either brightens or darkens their sphere; that they are to us chiefly what we are to them, — they servants and we masters; and that, in a more advanced stage, it will probably be still more true that the mind will —

“Be its own place,
And of itself can make a heaven of hell,
A hell of heaven;”

That every being, in other words, will bear all that is meant by those momentous words in his own bosom. But, if any one shall think otherwise, I dispute not the matter with him; it is sufficient for my purpose to say, that, in all the happiness that springs from his own soul, every man, in every world, shall be just as happy as he can.

Is it possible to believe otherwise? Is it possible to believe that the infinitely good Being, having given to man a certain nature, having given him a moral nature, for which it is of necessity difficult enough to tread the upward path, having given him in solemn trust faculties to cultivate, should deny

to him any amount of happiness of which he—the pupil—has made himself capable? Why should his mind, his culture, his character, yield him pain and torture if it is capable of high and holy enjoyment? It cannot be. It would be to cast out from the system of things all justice, love, and mercy,—everything that we mean by divine goodness.

But now let us more precisely understand what is to be meant—what especially in regard to a future world—by every man being as happy as he can. He cannot, then, be happy as an animal is. He cannot be happy in *another* world as a merely sensitive being; perhaps not at all as such; but on this we may not pronounce: there may be some finer vehicle for the soul which will be sensible to sight and sound; I would fain believe there will be. But this at least is certain: the load of *flesh* is dropped at death; and with it, doubtless, the grosser passions and appetites are left behind. And this further is certain: man cannot be happy except through pure and good affections. Hatred, malignity, envy, *cannot* be happy emotions; generosity, love, disinterestedness, cannot be, in their own nature and essence, unhappy feelings. And, again, a being cannot have *more* happiness than his power, culture, capacity, fits him to receive; and he whose better nature is neglected, debased, whose soul is narrowed, shrunk, shriveled by selfishness, poorness, meanness of spirit, must suffer corresponding deprivation of enjoyment.

Now let us suppose that we enter the other world under this just law. Nothing is to be done for us *intrinsically*, and nothing is to be done against us; things are to take their natural course. There is to be a change of circumstances; but not a change of the law—of the law of our nature—under which it must live forever. I know that this is a view which, by many persons, will be thought far too lenient. They are not content unless they conceive of the Supreme Being as hurling down wrath and destruction, raining fire and brimstone upon the guilty; or as lifting the just to golden thrones, and investing them with literal crowns of glory, in an illuminated palace or city. All this is doubtless mere figurative representation in the Bible; but some will have it to

be literal, and they will say that we take away both the terror and glory from the future life.

A little reflection, perhaps, will help us to see whether this is true. But certainly no one can expect a more *mild* and *fraternal* adjustment of the law of his nature than that which we have now represented as inevitable. If nothing shall be done for him, and nothing against him; if things shall take their own natural course, and the future moral order shall be, in its essential features, the prolongation of the present,—what must *that be*? What of deprivation and what of suffering must be the inevitable result of a bad life?

Now I frankly say, though the declaration from the pulpit may surprise you, that I have no desire to make the case simply *terrible*. The law of retribution is as truly addressed to hope as to fear. I must entirely free myself from the charge of any professional leaning towards dark views. My text leans the other way: Not for condemnation, it says, but that the world might be saved, was the Christ sent. The gospel leans to mercy. My own mind inclines me to the most favorable view of retribution that it can fairly admit. I would not make the case a whit harder than it is. *This* world is full enough of misery. But to suppose that the mass of mankind is to be precipitated from this into another state of unalleviated and everlasting torture! it is only wonderful that the human mind is not entirely crushed under this double weight. That it is not shows what an everlasting spring of hope and happiness there is in humanity. It shows too, doubtless, that the doctrine of the teachers is not fully believed. But let us have a doctrine that we can believe in. The inevitable law of our moral being will be found to press hard enough if we can once come to understand it.

Let, then, every human being think as favorably of his prospects as he can,—thinking, at the same time, *justly*,—thinking of his nature as it *is*. Let him be sure that God is good to him, and will forever be good. Let him be sure that Christ has come to him, not in wrath, but in mercy. Let him • be sure that all the laws of heaven were meant for good to him, and not for ill; and that they will *yield* all the good to

him that he is prepared to receive. Let him feel that the Creator of all this loveliness of heaven and earth loves him ; that nature embraces and feeds him as her child ; that the sky loves him ; that no sky under which he will ever be shall rain down any gratuitous or needless ill upon him. Oh ! no ; I will never believe that the infinite goodness and generosity have provided less for any being than to let him be as happy as he can.

But now what is, what must be, this measure of the infinite justice, of the infinite beneficence ? Let us look at *this* world ; for retribution truly begins here, and we cannot do better, perhaps, than to reason from what is to what shall be. God is good *here* ; and the Christian law is one of mercy ; and the splendor of heaven shines upon every creature ; and the earth is full of bounty. All invites to happiness. And the human frame and mind imbosom, for pure affections and simple tastes, the sweetest fountains of enjoyment. But suppose that by selfishness and self-indulgence a man poisons the cup. His mind is diseased and his body is diseased, and he is in misery, — pleasure gone, hope extinct, good name lost, the world dark and dreary, — such misery, indeed, that it would seem as if there could not be a more terrible doom for him than to go on in this way, mind and body becoming more diseased and miserable, through thousands of years. What way to happiness, then, can there be in *this* world for him, but to repent, to return, to treat his nature wisely, to cultivate it truly ?

Carry now this case to another world, and what other lot *can* follow *there* ? Can death change our very nature, or abrogate its laws ? How *can* it do so if the nature remain a moral nature, if it remain a high and sacred nature ? “ Why,” exclaims some sin-sick soul, some vitiated, corrupted, enervated soul, “ why can I not be happy, let me do as I will ? ” Blind that thou art ! seest thou not that love, truth, purity, nobleness, magnanimity, *are* the soul’s life and joy ; and that hatred, falsehood, sensuality, meanness, and debasement *must* poison and wound it to death ? Seest thou not that a soul could no longer *be* a soul if what thou askest for it would be

awarded? Thou wouldst have the sweetness and blessedness of sanctity *without* sanctity.

What then must follow? A being enters the other world all whose enjoyment has been derived from the senses, or whose whole capacity for enjoyment has attached itself exclusively to worldly objects, to fortune, to estate, to luxury, to the gratifications of sense, earthly pride, and vanity. There shall be no gold *there*, no throne, no flattering tongue, no verdict of shallow fashion, no feast nor cup of intoxication. Can less be expected in reason, can less be desired in mercy, than that the blessings abused, the fountains poisoned, should be cut off? that the soul at length should be left to itself, to that destitution of inward resources which is its own chosen part? There *is* a "*good* part," of which the Master said, "It shall never be taken away." But the worldly or the sensual man spurns *that*. With much self-complacency he says to the spiritually minded and the pure minded and the devout, "Very well; take your course; *we* desire none of your ways; we like *our* way better; go to your meetings, to your meditations, to your prayers; we like revelings, raptures of sensual passion, better; take your rigid self-denials, and welcome; let *us* have self-indulgences for our part." Well, they have had their chosen way, and it ends—it must forever end—in misery. Nobody can deny that unbridled self-indulgence, in the long run, is misery. And now, can anything better be expected in the world to come? anything better than that silence and solitariness and sorrow should settle upon the path that stretches out into the long, retributive future? I pretend to know nothing of the circumstances of the future. There may be society,—for the bad,—sad society. There may be alleviations of the lot. But certain it is, in our very nature, that every false step must be retrieved, every guilty indulgence denied, every abused or deadened faculty regenerated, every slighted opportunity mourned over before there can be any happiness. Aye, the self-denial must come; if not in pure and holy faith, then in dark and naked agony. Somewhere the work of self-purification must be done; if not in the laver of regeneration, in the cauldron of fire; if

not under the gracious discipline of repentance, under the terrible discipline of remorse; if not in mercy, then in judgment. And yet in mercy *still*; for God's judgment, as I must think of it, is ever merciful; but, merciful as it is, it must be terrible to all whom this life's discipline fails to correct: and it must grow more terrible, more dread and fearful, with every step in evil. Here is a man whom only daily intoxication saves from utter misery. Suppose that nature *here* should be so changed as to refuse one drop more of the intoxicating poison, or that some "Maine Law" should prevail over the land and over the world. It would be as the day of judgment to that man. Can a less fearful crisis be expected in the future world?

Look at it in another light. Here is a man so narrow-minded, so mean, so selfish, that he can see no happiness, no good, no glory but his own,—nothing but his own enjoyment or advantage. What makes for him interests him; nothing beside. Through this pin-hole he looks at the universe. Well, he shall be just as happy as he can; he shall receive as much light, glory, joy into his soul as possible. But how little must it be? He looks through this pin-hole; he cannot see much. Rather, should I not say, he looks through an inverted telescope, and sees nothing but himself? Glorious forms are around him, majestic and beautiful natures, firmaments of happy creatures fill the deeps of heaven; but it is nothing to *him*. It *might* fill him with transports of joy; but he does not see it; by his own act he has cut himself off from all the light and glory of the universe.

Must we not go further and say that the picture of moral *deprivation* may be darker *still*? Here is a being filled with malignity, with envy. He hates the favored, the happy, the blest. He does not love the bright shining of blessed and beautiful things. Oh! I have seen such a spirit, to which its neighbor's fortune, beauty, rank, splendor, were all hateful. What a world, what a universe, is this for such a soul? All round are happy creatures; all round are starry realms; all round are anthems of praise and gladness. And from all this boundless convex that surrounds that soul come echoes

that fill it with *pain*, and heavenly beams that blast it with misery. The light is darkness ; and how great is that darkness ! What a condition of the soul is that ! and yet is it not possible, where the very light around is darkness, and the very happiness of others makes it misery ?

And what an isolation must *that* be ! what a severing from all good ! what an exclusion from all happy society, whether in this world or another ! To have men say, "We do not want *you*," is painful enough to an envious soul *here*. But here envy finds some relief in the supposed injustice done it, in the marked lines of official and social distinction, and in many worldly appliances. But if in the pure spiritual realm beings of lofty nature and converse should say that, — and it is felt that the exclusion is just, is inevitable, — what must envy be there ? Would it be too much to say, "It must be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth" ?

Are not these things worthy of being thought of ? May not such things be ? Say that they are speculative — are they not rational ? In reason, in nature, in humanity, must not these things be ? I desire not to make moving pictures, but a rational impression. Our minds are so wrested from all rational direction, and defrauded of all just impression, by the common and mechanical partitioning out of the future world into states utterly differing from one another, and utterly differing from the present life, that the solemn retribution hereafter is to us more a seeming, a doctrine, a dream, than a reality. Whether any one is satisfied with the representation we have made or not, let, I say, the conviction sink deeply into him that there *must* be a retribution ; that it is a part of his nature ; and that he could not have a moral, a high, a sacred nature without it. The case is plain ; and he that runs may read. Here is a being wishing, longing to be happy. It is a terrible thing to him to be miserable. And, by all the realities of our life and nature ! this is not matter for coarse and clumsy calculation, — this of happiness and misery. It needs not that a man be beaten with rods, or that he welter in a flood of fire, to be made miserable. An indignity, a reproach, a condemning word falls upon him like a blow.

A *feeling* in his own heart may pierce him like a sword. A passion may burn into him like fire. And of such feeling or passion, of these elements of inward misery, must he get rid. Here or hereafter, in this world or another world, — let every selfish, envious, vitiated soul know it! — here or hereafter he must get rid of them, or he will never be happy.

It is a fearful law, doubtless, under which we live, and shall live forever; but it is a law as truly addressed to hope as to fear. It is a fearful thing to have a nature like ours, — well if many a negligent soul should awake to *that!* — but it may be a glorious thing, and was meant to be. God sent not his Son into the world to condemn this nature, but to save it. He wills not the death of the sinner, but would that the sinner should turn to him and live. *Let* the soul turn to Him, the Father of infinite glory and goodness; let it turn to all things pure and good and glorious; let its hopes, aspirations, let its affections expand into vast and immortal capacities; they shall be filled — with immeasurable and immortal good they shall be filled. Open thy heart wide, stretch thine arms to the widest reach, widen, widen the vast horizon of faith and love and hope; streams from the immeasurable universe of good shall flow in and fill to overflowing thine utmost capacity.

Oh! what a thing is *joy!* not common and common-place well-being, but deep-felt, pure joy, such as things beautiful, lovely, and best loved give! How in the deepest heart is there forever a sighing, and a sighing for *that!* What matters poverty, neglect, obscurity, the humblest lot, if within all is imbosomed some great satisfaction, some divine joy! Thou shalt *have* it, if thou wilt. Thou shalt be as happy as thou hast qualification and capacity for being happy. Calamity shall not touch thee, earth cannot darken thy lot, hell could not make thee miserable, so that thou hast in thee a divine love, so that God, the blessed, dwelleth in thee. Joy, joy, thou shalt have if thou wilt; and it shall grow in thee forever, if thou wilt. Widen, I say, expand thy hopes as much as thou canst; think, muse, dream of happiness all that thou canst; stretch thine imagination to the utmost; and it shall

all come short of the reality. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard; neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive the things that God hath prepared for them that love him."

Such, in fine, is the law of all our welfare. It is a law addressed to hope, to infinite hope, as well as to fear. That has always seemed to me one of the most striking declarations of Holy Writ,— "We are not straitened in God, but we are straitened in ourselves." In God is infinite fullness, infinite bounty, infinite kindness. The ocean of his beneficence, like the literal ocean, fills not only the vast deeps, but every bay and inlet, and every little crevice in the rocks, upon its boundless shores. We are not straitened in God; we are not restricted to scanty supplies of good because *his* bounty fails. No: it is in ourselves that we are straitened. It is because our hearts are not *big* enough to receive more than our joy, our blessing, is so little. It is because we have not opened and widened them to the free and ever-flowing streams of the infinite beneficence that they are withered and dried like potsheards. How can there be any great, swelling, sufficing joy in the mind that is narrowed by selfishness, or shut up in selfish distrust and jealousy! How, especially when the fountain of joy, the precious vase that holds it, is not only small, but is cracked into flaws by parching ambition, or broken into rents by raging passions!

And that which is true now, and here, must be true forever. Put any low-minded, selfish, base, and brutish soul into the Garden of Eden, into the elysium of heaven, into any sphere with everything around to fill the noble and pure soul with divine felicity, and it would be nothing for *him*. Wearily the day would pass, and wearily eternity must pass to such an one.

But place a high, generous, great, pure soul anywhere, and a great joy is forever flowing through it; streams of refreshment from earth, streams of light from heaven, are pouring into it; wider and wider it grows forever, realm after realm of good is taken into its vast capacity; till it is filled with all the fullness of God, till it is overflowing with all the beatitudes of heaven.

FROUDE'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

THE completion of Mr. Froude's laborious and elaborate History prompts us to say a few words concerning the work as a whole, in addition to the notices we have made of it in connection with the publication of the successive volumes, in the elegant and convenient reprint from the Riverside Press in Cambridge, issued by Charles Scribner and Co. of New York.

We are among those—and we think they are the large majority of its readers—who attach the highest historic value to this work, and who also estimate its literary qualities as satisfactory, if not superior. That is, we believe we have in it as faithful and adequate a representation of historic facts, and as close an approximation to the actual truth in narration and comment, as we are ever likely to possess,—certainly in our own lifetime.

The new materials opened to use by the free access allowed within a very few years to the contents of national archives, heretofore so jealously concealed and restricted, made it necessary that all our histories should be rewritten for the sake of authenticating received conclusions, or offering decisive evidence in support of views and opinions which were to be substituted for them. Mr. Froude has regarded the State Papers—and among these chiefly the correspondence of the resident ambassadors, special envoys, and agents of the continental and British courts—as the best documentary authorities which he could use, exercising in the meanwhile his own judgment in allowing for the artifice, prevarication, and falsehood which abound in them.

He has concluded to confine the range of his pen between the fall of Wolsey and the defeat of the Spanish Armada,—a century crowded with exciting and bewildering interest. His first intention was to follow Elizabeth's life to its close. We cannot but hope that we shall yet have from him either a literary or an historical production which shall trace for us the splendors and glories of that later portion of her reign, when the defeat of Spain's Armada and the circumvention of

the continental plots having secured for her and her realm immunity from dangers most threatening, left the nation to enjoy its triumph.

Four leading historic characters, each one of them a problem for study and the keenest controversial variance of estimate, are drawn out to us, with many less conspicuous and effective agents, in Mr. Froude's twelve volumes, — Henry VIII., Mary of Scotland, Elizabeth of England, and her great Minister of State, Burghley. We put the last in the category, for his consummate statesmanship on the one side, and his skillful ingenuity in adapting himself to his perverse and self-willed mistress, make him a peer with monarchs. It may be regarded now as a settled fact in the championships of historic literature, that these four dramatic personages will always serve to test the skill of special pleaders in heightening or softening the shades of immorality which attach to them because of the crooked and tortuous tenor of their conduct and policy. Yet the relation and the study have a marvelous interest. We can say for ourselves that no romance which we have ever read has detained us over its pages with a more absorbed and quickened engagement of feeling than has Mr. Froude's history, as he traces out the incidents and draws the portraiture of the actors, and fills in the episodes with the tragic and the comic elements of this wonderfully complicated and mazy drama of English annals. To those who are seeking for a fireside entertainment for the coming winter, we say find it in Froude.

G. E. E.

THANKFULNESS.

I THANK thee, O my God! who made
The earth so bright, —
So full of splendor and of joy,
Beauty and light;
So many glorious things are here,
Noble and bright.

I thank thee, too, that thou hast made
Joy to abound ;
So many gentle thoughts and deeds
Circling us round ;
That in the darkest spot on earth
Some love is found.

I thank thee more that all our joy
Is touched with pain ;
That shadows fall on brightest hours ;
That thorns remain :
So that earth's bliss may be our guide,
And not our chain.

For thou, who knowest, Lord, how soon
Our weak heart clings,
Hast given us joys, tender and true,
Yet all with wings ;
So that we see, gleaming on high,
Diviner things.

I thank thee, Lord, that thou hast kept
The best in store ;
We have enough, yet not too much
To long for more ;
A yearning for a deeper peace,
Not known before.

I thank thee, Lord, that here our souls,
Though amply blest,
Can never find, although they seek,
A perfect rest, —
Nor ever shall, until they lean
On Jesus' breast.

ADELAIDE PROCTOR.

A peace, worth all the specious goods which this world has at its disposal, will ever be found in a simple and contented mind, in an affectionate heart, and in a pure and honorable life.

TOPICS OF THE MONTH.

BY J. W. THOMPSON.

WHITSUNTIDE: THE OFFICE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

According to a view which contains in it a profound truth, says Robertson, the ages of the world are divisible into three dispensations, presided over by the Father, the Son, and the Spirit.

In the dispensation of the Father, God was known as a Creator; creation manifested his eternal power and godhead, and the religion of mankind was the religion of nature.

In the dispensation of the Son, God manifested himself to humanity through man; the Eternal Word spoke through the inspired and exalted of the human race to those who were uninspired and unexalted. This was the dispensation of the Prophets; its climax was the coming of Christ; it was completed when perfect humanity in him manifested God to man. The characteristic of this dispensation was, that God revealed himself by an authoritative voice, speaking from without, and the highest manifestation of God whereof man was capable was a Divine Humanity in Jesus. The age which succeeded, that in which we at present live, is the dispensation of the Spirit, in which God has communicated himself by the highest revelation and in the most intimate communion of which man is capable; no longer through creation alone, no more, simply, as an authoritative voice from without, but as a Law within — as Spirit mingling with our spirits. This is the dispensation of whose close the Apostle Paul speaks thus: "Then shall the Son also be subject to him that hath put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

This theory of the order of the Divine dispensations corresponds with the truth of history. It should not be thought, however, that the first dispensation — that through nature — ended when the second — that through the Beloved Son — began; nor that the dispensation of the Son has ceased now

that that of the Holy Spirit is come. One followed the other, not to supplant it, but as an addition to it. God still speaks to us through nature and by the voice of the Beloved Son, no less than in the "demonstration of the Spirit;" and our feeling the motions of the Spirit within, striving with our spirits to expel the evil and to replace it with the powers of a divine life, is no reason why we should shut our ears to the voice of the Son declaring the law of the eternal life or our eyes to the manifold beauty and glory of the outward creation revealing the invisible things of the Creator, even his eternal power and godhead.

In order that we may see the place and office of the Holy Spirit in the economy of Divine Grace, let us suppose that Christianity had given to us only the knowledge of God as Father and the example of a perfect human life in the Beloved Son. The former would have been a great joy to the heart and the latter a stimulating ideal for the formation of character. At first thought, it might seem that these are enough, but a little reflection proves that they are not. Ah! how shall man, with feeble moral purposes, with religious desires intermittent and languid, his mind immersed in material interests, how shall he, bent to the earth under the weight of his physical nature, as so many are, straighten himself up to the task and pursue it, unaided and alone, of transforming the frail creature he is into the image of a true child of God as seen in the face of Jesus Christ? Surely we want something beside; and if we were to express this want in the form of prayer we should bow our knees before the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and say: "Send down thy Holy Spirit to reinforce our halting wills, to quicken our torpid consciences, to give a fresh start and glow to our dull affections, to make us what we despair of making ourselves. Let it take the outward revelation in nature and the Word and put it within us, according to that ancient promise, 'After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts, and I will be their God and they shall be my people.'" A Divine Helper who can enter this inner chamber of man's life, touch

the secret springs of his immortal nature, supply new impulse and strength to his faint and weary heart, assist the feeble beginnings of his high endeavor, — a Helper and Comforter, too, to allay the fevers of the anxious brain and still the throbbings of the trembling breast, — such a Helper, such a Comforter, is not this our want? And would not the Divine Dispensations be incomplete without such a manifestation of the *present* power and love of God?

Now for the coming of this Helper and Comforter Jesus prepared the way as John did for the Messiah. The coming was attended by "signs and wonders," as Christ's had been, to secure its immediate recognition. But when the Holy Spirit had become a recognized power in the church, its miraculous demonstrations ceased; and thenceforward through the Christian centuries this form of Divine Influence has been known only in the experience of the private heart or by observation of its silent effects in the life of the church. In these ways, however, it has been unmistakably manifest. Its manifestation is no fancy, no dream of musing enthusiasm, but a reality as veritable and authentic as the life of God in nature and in Christ.

The chief characteristic of the dispensation through the Son is, it will have been seen, that God reveals himself from without by an authoritative voice, imparting knowledge of things unseen and eternal. The chief characteristic of the dispensation through the Holy Spirit is, that God reveals himself as an inward power working secretly in the believer's bosom, convicting of sin, scattering the shades of doubt, confirming the word spoken to the outward ear, breathing peace, and bearing witness with our spirits that we are children of God.

Chevalier Bunsen in his great work, "Christianity and Mankind," pronounces the Pentecostal demonstration of the Spirit the greatest miracle of the church; because, he says, "it was deeply symbolical and typical of the wonderful religious development of ages to come." And the miracle, in his view, consisted not in "the sound from heaven" nor in "the cloven tongues of fire," but in the fact that at the moment

the gathered company were all moved by a common and irrepressible impulse to call upon God, not in the set forms of their sacred language, but each in his own mother-tongue, as the Spirit gave him utterance. And this he regards as a most portentous and deeply significant sign that religion was henceforth to cease to be an external, or sacerdotal and ceremonial worship; that the true temple of God, in which all languages of the earth should be heard celebrating his praise, was opened; while the house of Levitical sanctity and the proud temples of the Hellenic world, with all their ideals of beauty, were doomed to fall. And so he calls it "the inauguration of the era of the Spirit," rendering all tongues vocal through its inspiration, hallowing social life by instituting a true brotherhood of all peoples, initiating a universal worship springing from individual aspiration and childlike thankfulness, foreshadowing, also, that glorious epoch when, fifteen centuries later, the noblest nations of Europe, breaking from the Papacy, made their vulgar tongues sacred for the expression of immortal thought, so that Christian congregations no longer praised God in the dead languages of their priesthood, but in the living accents learned from their mother's lips.

But whatever may have been the nature of the Pentecostal miracle, the incoming of the Spirit as an abiding presence and power in the church and in each individual soul open to its reception dates, as an accepted truth of the Christian consciousness, from that event. Then began to be heard the cry so tenderly voiced by a sweet psalmist of the Spirit, in the well-known lines, —

Wilt thou not visit me ?
The plant beside me feels thy gentle dew ;
Each blade of grass I see,
From thy deep earth its quickening moisture drew.

Wilt Thou not visit me ?
Thy morning calls on me with cheering tone ;
And every hill and tree
Lend but one voice, the voice of Thee alone.

Come ! for I need Thy love,
More than the flower the dew, or grass the rain ;
Come, like Thy holy dove,
And let me in Thy light rejoice to live again.

Yes ! Thou wilt visit me ;
Nor plant nor tree Thine eye delights so well,
As when from sin set free,
Man's spirit comes with Thine in peace to dwell.*

Joy to the world ! the Lord is come, not alone in the outward universe and in the life and word of the Beloved Son, but in the inward witness of his Spirit, bringing conviction to the world of sin, and of righteousness and of judgment ; and guiding faithful seekers into all truth. Joy to the world ! the Comforter is come, and is making felt more and more deeply, in this our day, the tender Care, the faithful Judgments, the mighty Love, the indwelling Peace, of our God. Be still and listen to the heavenly oracle. It is not hidden from us, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven that we should say, Who shall go up for us to heaven and bring it unto us ? Neither is it beyond the sea that we should say, Who shall go over the sea for us and bring it unto us ? But its word is very nigh unto us, in our mouth and in our heart, that we may do it.

DEATH OF CHARLES DICKENS.

It was a great surprise of grief which fell upon men of letters and upon the multitude to whom the name of Mr. Dickens had long been a synonym for all that is most charming in the literature of fiction, when it was announced that he had suddenly ceased from his labors and fallen asleep. The press of two continents, of all shades of opinion, political and religious, though almost stunned by the tidings, quickly rallied, as under one universal inspiration, with only here and there a dismal exception, to utter its grateful memory and to pour out its mighty sorrow.

* Mr. Jones Very.

No single quality so much distinguishes the pages of this admired and lamented child of genius as their natural, broad, genial, exquisitely delicate and tender humanity. Indeed, this is not so much a quality as the animating spirit of them, glowing in all their descriptions, in their incomparable humor, their ready ingenuous wit, their tearful but quiet pathos. Mankind is his debtor not only for the healthful pleasure which has sprung up under the magic of his pen in thousands of homes and millions of hearts, but for putting into forms so attractive and fascinating so much of the finest essence of Christianity. We say this with careful deliberation. In all the volumes which Mr. Dickens has given to the world we remember nothing which should make a Christian blush or grieve; whilst we do discover pervading them, as electricity the atmosphere, the humanities, the charities, the noble aspirations, the enriching faiths, the tender and soothing hopes, which are the sweet and beautiful vintage of the True Vine. It may be unorthodox and deserving of damnation to laugh and make laugh in this solemn world, but for ourselves we hold that man a benefactor entitled to universal gratitude, who, having the power to amuse and delight, — to cast gleams of sunshine into the darkling lot of poor mortals, to enliven "the daily round" of care and toil, to induce haggard trouble, chronic ennui, physical and mental overwork, "loathed melancholy," the devil himself, to take a little vacation once in a while, — who having this power, we say, uses it freely for these purposes, without detriment to any virtue or grace of character. Religion, in the restricted sense of the word, is not the only chord in the many-stringed harp of humanity which may lawfully be touched with Christian fingers; but he who brings forth dulcet sounds in due proportion from each, blending them all, is master of the divine harmonies and the true "man of God." He is the real artist, trained for his calling by apprenticeship to Truth, Beauty, and Love. In the roll of such artists, representatives of the best literature with the heartfelt assent of their readers have hastened to place the brilliant and beloved name of Charles Dickens. He is at rest "with kings and counselors of the earth." All ranks

from the most humble to the most exalted mourn for him, even as they have rejoiced in him. But they mourn not as though he had just begun his splendid career of beneficent ministration to human happiness, but as for one who has finished well the tasks of life. For he had done enough for his fame, and far more than his part for humanity; and, after all, he has left the most and the best of himself behind. Let his requiem be the thanksgiving-psalms of the vast multitude whose eyes have glistened and whose hearts have throbbed under the wondrous spell of his creative fancy. His "funeral anthem," let it be "the glad evangel" of sympathy with man in his loneliness, want, struggle, sorrow, and sin, which his silent word shall preach from generation to generation.

"THE CHRISTIAN REGISTER'S" GREETING TO "THE LIBERAL CHRISTIAN."

There is something extremely affecting in the welcome to its own platform which "The Register" extends to its younger brother of New York. With eyes glistening and dilated, with arms extended to embrace the returned penitent, its emotion will only permit it to exclaim, "Back Again!" It then breathes upon the forgiven prodigal the affectionate hope that hereafter it will stick to "the old denominational position" which "The Register," with strange infatuation, thinks itself to have steadfastly occupied! We are of opinion that "The Register" has departed from "the old denominational position," and that it must take some steps backward before it will be entitled to speak as its representative. "The Register" interprets a recent editorial of "The Liberal Christian" as denoting a change from its lately declared Christian Unitarianism "back" to its old platform of common denominational "action with avowed unbelievers." Does "The Register" feel quite sure that the editorial which it transfers to its columns with so much glee will be endorsed by the proprietors and managers of "The Liberal Christian"? It should not be too confident. It may turn out that the young editor, who cannot be presumed to

be so well acquainted with our "denominational position" as he will be with a little more experience, started off without consultation with his superiors, to try an experiment on the liberality of his readers. For ourselves, we are disposed to judge him leniently in consideration of his youthful inexperience, and to put the best construction we can upon his indiscretions and absurdities. As long as the Rev. A. P. Putnam will furnish such clear, cogent, unanswerable arguments as those which appear in the issue containing the editorial in question, an effectual antidote will accompany the bane; the only trouble in the case being, that the reader must swallow both.

Notwithstanding his occasional mistakes, however, we have the friendliest feelings towards this young editor, and have enjoyed even to admiration the truth, force, beauty, and eloquence of several leaders from his pen. We have sometimes thought within ourselves, What a splendid preacher that man must be if only he speaks as well as he writes. How he must sway an assembly by the power and charm of that wondrous enthusiasm which seems to be ever burning at the fount of his being! Knowing the peculiar embarrassments of his situation, from having occasionally witnessed in the circus the feat of riding two horses at once, we are tempted, as his senior and out of pure good will, to proffer to him a little paternal advice, in the comfortable hope that it may be sanctified to him. We advise him, then, to review faithfully his own editorial, of which the leading organ of another liberal denomination says, "Of all the documents we have ever read from a Unitarian in defence of the anomalous position of that denomination, we think the editorial in the last number of 'The Liberal Christian' the least satisfactory. It makes apparent the utter instability and hopeless confusion of the whole concern. Beyond that it develops nothing." So, we advise him to review it. Scrutinizing it with his clear, calm eye, he will discover that it puts the denomination in a new, untenable, and false position, perilous in view of the ides of November! We advise him, further, that in reviewing his paper he keep before him for reference the admirable *Pronun-*

ciamento of Dr. Bellows to be found in "The Liberal Christian" of Oct., 17, 1868. It may not be amiss if we indicate two or three points which, following Dr. Bellows' lead, he will be compelled to modify. For instance, the editor says, "In spite of our Preamble, we cannot refuse fellowship to any who, putting their own interpretation on it, come into our body under it, even though their interpretations substantially do it away." Cannot refuse fellowship! Why? Is not ours a voluntary body? Is it not FREE to make its own rules, to determine with whom it will co-operate, what works it will approve, what faith it will foster, in short, what kind of a church, with God's help, it will build up? But hear Dr. Bellows:—

"If their consciences" [meaning the few who seem to be excluded by our Christian definition] "are so tender and their views so advanced that they cannot work with us upon a platform which, without a single other dogma, *distinctly avows discipleship of the Lord Jesus Christ*, then it is plain that we have come to a boundary which the Unitarian denomination cannot pass. If, as it is claimed, there are thousands of religious people who are outside of so broad a pale as ours, *surely there is room for a new kind of religion*. And its apostles may as well go to work at once to occupy the providential field."

This is what we call sound sense, and the right spirit.

Again; this editorial breaks out: "Shall we not, by constancy and fidelity to our principle, compel the world to see that the Unitarian denomination, *founded on the principle of absolute freedom* in the exercise of reason and the right of private judgment, cannot cut off those who choose to stand in it, even if they deny Christianity itself; and yet that we hold Christianity as dear and sacred as those who seek to emphasize and protect their reverence for and faith in it by all manner of dogmatic and ecclesiastic conclusions? At any rate, this—with all its opprobrium and suspicions—is the historical position and sacred policy of the Unitarian denomination."

Now we solemnly deny that this is either the historical position or the sacred policy of the Unitarian denomination. But let Dr. Bellows give his views on the subject:—

"We have millions of people to fold in the positive fold of Christian discipleship. . . . They are equally averse to orthodoxy and to a bare theism; they are neither prepared to go back into the old temples nor to live out of doors. . . . We have a faith which our antecedents and our literature have made more or less definite, which we call the Unitarian faith. *It is founded on the divine authority of the Christian religion.* We are forced by the love of peace to leave the words 'divine authority' to the private interpretation of each disciple. This faith has its churches and its organization. . . . Our urgent duty resolves itself practically into a more energetic and systematic pursuit of the humble work we have been engaged in for fifty years—building up a Christian denomination *on the old foundation*, but with liberty and love and holiness wrought more fully into its walls."

Again; this editorial asserts with careless haste or strange presumption: "The denomination is founded, not on Christ, and not on the Bible, and not on opinion, and not on theology; but on the right as Christians of free inquiry and free confession, the right of progress and change and challenge of opinion in all spiritual things. We neither affirm or deny our Christianity in asserting that *the fundamental principle of the Unitarian denomination is this right and principle of absolute freedom.*"

But Dr. Bellows looks clearly into the heart of the thing and thus forcibly expresses his view:—

"You well know I have a great love for freedom and a great hostility to any needless restraints. But I know that a Christian church, or a permanent Christian ministry, or a Christian denomination, cannot be built up *if freedom is the sole or the main interest of the people who support it.* There are such things yet as justice, truth, duty, comity, morality, piety, and faith; there are such things yet as vested rights and implied obligations; there are such things yet as wisdom and prudence, seniority in experience, right to give counsel, and obligation to heed it, deference from the young for the

authority of age and experience" [we commend this member of the sentence to the special attention of the editor]; "there are such things yet as institutional virtues and obligations. . . . And for one, because it happens to be a popular error of our time that he is the noblest, the most heroic, the most progressive, the most of a nineteenth-century man, who avows the most unqualified faith in freedom as its own safeguard and mother of all the graces and virtues and securities, will I falsify my own profound convictions or suppress my fears that the freedom which makes one man, ignorant and senseless as he may be, think his opinion as good as his minister's who has perhaps given his life to thinking and to Christian study; or encourages his young minister to set up his personal speculations against those of his theological professors, as if they were only his peers; or which makes a pastor think his own individual notions of Christianity what the people come to church to hear, and not the gospel according to the received ideas of the body to which he professes to belong—that such a freedom is the freedom of intellectual bandits, and not of a civil, social, and moral order; and that no visible church, much less any Christian denomination, can exist and flourish in such an atmosphere. It leads to the worst tyranny. . . . It gives single men of exceptional boldness and unbridled license of speculation the perilous opportunity of placarding a whole body of churches and ministers with the odium of their private excesses of opinion; and sometimes taints a Christian denomination with the suspicion of the infidelity which is avowed by some one of its ministers."

And, once more, this editorial stoutly maintains that "as a denomination we cannot have a creed; we cannot make an authoritative statement, Christian or otherwise. . . . It will not make a creed lest its creed should imprison or harden it." Very prettily it observes that the denomination "loves its faith too well to put the living, growing plant in any Sevres vase, however honored, and set it on its window sill for the world to admire." But Dr. Bellows with a much keener insight and from a fuller experience declares that we greatly need a "Statement of Belief." We need it, he says, for our orthodox converts and we need it *for ourselves*.

"Our children, for want of it, cannot say their souls are their

own, and they are not their own, but at the mercy of any diligent and skillful theological casuist who has interest enough to convert them to his opinions. They cannot tell in one case out of fifty what they think or believe, after ten years in the Sunday school; nor can our ordinary laymen usually give any clear and definite account of their own faith. If we have no faith, let us say so, and cease beating the drum and calling attention to nothing. But we do have a faith capable of positive statement; a Christian faith which can be stated negatively towards the errors of the churches about us, or, better, positively towards the gospel itself.

"There is no duty more urgent than the duty of furnishing our people with a DEFINITE CHRISTIAN STATEMENT OF BELIEF. I will not say that we can lay down a platform or publish a creed for the next thousand years or the next hundred years. I am much more concerned for the religious wants of the next ten years. We cannot suit everybody, and we must not permit a few who can never be suited to stand in the way of wants so general and so legitimate."

We think Dr. Bellows never spoke truer or more timely words. We hope our young friend of "The Liberal Christian" will study him attentively, and also take in good part our criticism of his elaborate but rather crude editorial, on which we fear he may have begun to plume himself too much after reading the highly complimentary notice of "The Register." Though not admiring this particular editorial — which seems to have been the product of a wild impulse rather than the fruit of sober thought — we have read, let us repeat, many things from the same vigorous pen, kept steady by a bold, large, deeply earnest heart and soul of faith, which have won our total respect, and given us "assurance of a man" thoroughly furnished for his work and whose lead therein it would be alike a duty and a privilege to follow. We shall watch with interest — the interest of jealous friendship — his future course; supporting him in it with the little strength we may be able to control and render, if there be no deviation from the CHRISTIAN PLATFORM, substantially as laid down by Dr. Bellows; but leaving and opposing him upon the first sign of departure from that.

THE WOMAN QUESTION IN THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

This question was introduced by the Rev. J. T. Sargent. Dr. Clarke offered the following resolution :—

"Resolved, That in the opinion of this body it is eminently proper that women as well as men should be elected to the Executive Committee of the American Unitarian Association."

This resolution was passed with only six negative votes. The result was received with hearty applause. Since the adoption of the resolution we have received a letter from one of the most earnest Christian women we have ever known, portions of which we have great pleasure in laying before our readers. We need scarcely say that we shall be most happy to give to her our vote in the election of the "Executive Committee" next year.

"The woman question," she writes, "has made rapid strides, and though I have not much sympathy with it, I think it may have had an influence upon me to encourage me to express my mind to you. And, first, I want to say that I was and am glad that you were not present at the business meeting of Tuesday forenoon; for I fear you would have been taken off your feet, and carried with the powerful current of feeling and opinion that swayed the meeting. All heads were turned with the worship of liberty above everything else. It seems to be a fever raging throughout the denomination, if that meeting may be considered as representing the denomination,—a fever providentially permitted, perhaps, for some wise end. It occurs to me that this wave of feeling may be permitted now to rise higher than its rightful place in order that in returning to its proper level it may fix itself more firmly and deeply in the hearts of the people; for, indeed, it is a beautiful, noble, and necessary principle of religion in its place. So, perhaps, it may be well to let it alone for a while to do its work in its own way. Certain am I that I cannot go with it,—that neither the eloquence of Dr. —, nor the prolonged and repeated applause of an enthusiastic audience, nor anything else that I heard last week, had any power to move me to place this idol in my own heart above my allegiance to my

Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. To be sure, nothing special was said, that I remember, about allegiance to Jesus Christ, except that Mr. Lowe, in his statement of the policy of the Association, said that that was an understood feature of it; but the Association, by an almost unanimous vote of its members, absolutely refused to furnish Mr. Hepworth, Mr. Collyer, and Mr. Mayo with one single article of belief which they could take home and show to inquirers as a purely Unitarian doctrine. Now it seems to me that there are some fundamental, everlasting doctrines that we ought all to agree upon, if we do not; as, for instance, the Fatherhood of God, the divine authority of Jesus Christ, the free and blessed agency of the Holy Spirit, the dignity and worth of the human soul, the necessity of regeneration, the certainty of retribution, and perhaps some others. Are these doctrines of which we can or may say, 'Good for this day only?' Are they not the *same yesterday, to-day, and forever?*

"Then why be ashamed or afraid to show them to the world as Unitarian doctrines? Suppose some weaker brother cannot yet accept all or any of these doctrines, — need he necessarily be excluded from fellowship with us? May we not still say to him, 'If you want to become the man God meant you to be, come with us, be one of us, and let us show you how, — let us show you our treasure and help you to share it with us, so that you may be a partaker, not merely of our fellowship, but of our *joy*'? I do not see why such a statement of simple Christian doctrines, not held up as a test of fellowship, but held forth as an *encouragement to fellowship*, is not perfectly consistent with the largest and broadest Christian liberty; and liberty that is not Christian is no liberty at all. But I am willing that the statement, if need be, should be narrowed down to one single point, namely, the divine authority of Jesus Christ as revealed in the New Testament, — for, after all, that includes everything. Now I truly believe that the majority of Unitarians are believers in Jesus, and would indignantly repudiate any suspicion to the contrary. And I know that they have embodied this belief in the Preamble to the Constitution of the National Conference. If, then, they hold and value this belief, and have agreed upon it and expressed it once, why, in the name of consistency, are they not willing to declare it again, and a thousand times if called for?

"Well, now, in view of the present state of things, what ought to be done? When I think of the business meeting of the American

Unitarian Association, I feel as though something ought to be done right away; but when I think of the morning 'conference and prayer meetings' I do not feel in so much of a hurry, but have more hope that the vital principle of our religion will assert its own place in due time, if let alone.

"On the whole, in view of the danger of being misunderstood, and causing hard feelings and division while the liberty fever is running high, I think it would be hardly wise to act in any *organized* way at present. But we must not sit with folded hands; there are other ways of action. Let individual Christians be more earnest in their allegiance to Christ, and take no special pains to conceal it, as Unitarians are apt to do. And I have a presentiment that the blessed weekly prayer-meeting we are going to have will be just the instrumentality that we want, to give expression to and strengthen socially, this feeling and principle. And by and by, perhaps sooner than we expect, Unitarians will be able and willing and glad to say, *as a body*, to the world, 'We are persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature,' (not even individual liberty and liberality,) 'shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord.'

"I hope that you will not think me presumptuous in writing these thoughts to you. I do not write them because I think you care anything about what I think or don't think. They so press upon me that I feel as though I must relieve myself of them by expressing them to some one, and I know of no one who would be so likely to understand them and sympathize with them as you.

"I never before liked Mr. Hepworth so well as I did last week. When Mr. Collyer and Mr. Mayo were subdued and silenced by the crushing words of Dr. Bellows, the tremendous applause that followed, and words to the same effect from one and another that followed, after they had all had their say, Mr. Hepworth got up and said, 'I suppose you think I'm scared, but I am not. I know I am right, and I mean to keep this thing going, and fight it out, if it takes all summer.' I could not help admiring his undaunted persistency in the face of opinion and feeling without argument,—such argument, I mean, as might bear upon his case and affect it. He was not so overpowered but that he could see that all their talk was aimed against "a man of straw," and not against what he wanted at

all, and so could not affect him. Do, please, send him a word of sympathy if you can.

"*Postscript.* — I have just discovered something which serves me as a key to the strange words and actions of that Association meeting, and puts the state of affairs in perhaps a rather more hopeful light. In the 'Register' of May 21 is a short article entitled, "The Question stated," which is utterly false from beginning to end, so far as I know anything about it. The members of the Association, who of course read the 'Register,' came to the meeting, therefore, stuffed and prejudiced against the new movement, as stated in that article, and cocked and primed to resist it, as soon as the cause should be presented. They were confirmed and strengthened in their feeling by the essay, or statement of policy, delivered by the Secretary, who, also, was laboring under the same error. Ninetenths of all he said was an earnest protest against a creed which nobody wanted, that I could discover, but which he would make it appear there was a strong demand for. Therefore, when Mr. Hepworth came forward with something that bore resemblance to the enemy they were expecting, they probably said within themselves, 'There's our man; now let us beware,' and fortified themselves so strongly against him that they could not discriminate between what he wanted and what they *supposed* he wanted, although he spoke plainly enough. But when Dr. Bellows got up and set before himself and the audience an image as different in magnitude from that which Mr. Hepworth wanted as the heavens are higher than the earth, absurd and unreasonable upon the very face of it, and then fired away upon it with his characteristic eloquence, — of course knocking it down with the first blow, — the enthusiasm of the deluded audience knew no bounds, and the die was cast against Mr. Hepworth. Now, under this light Mr. Hepworth's case looks more hopeful, for inasmuch as they were all deceived by a false prejudice at the time, so that they could not *understand* him, there is yet a chance that when they *do* understand him, if they ever do, they may be more favorably inclined towards his case.

"*The Inevitable Second 'P.S.'* — As I think about the real nature of Mr. Hepworth's proposition, and the probable result if he should gain his end, I begin to be really satisfied and glad that it was postponed, not because I am losing any of my sympathy for Mr. Hepworth, but because I strongly feel that any statement of faith that he might be able to draw from the Unitarian body now would not only come with strife and contention, but would not be exactly the

thing to meet the deep want that is beginning to be felt among us ; and when we have anything at all it ought to be that one thing. If I understand it rightly, our want is this : a distinct, open, unequivocal avowal, once for all, that we stand upon the foundation of Jesus Christ as revealed in the New Testament, from which we will not be moved by any consideration whatever. This we want for our rock. Then if we can have in addition a clear, concise statement of such fundamental truths as we have been able to deduce from the revelation of God by Jesus Christ, with the distinct assertion and understanding that it is only the nucleus and not the whole of Unitarianism, and with an earnest protest against its ever being made a test-creed, embodied in it somehow so that it cannot be taken out without mutilating and violating the whole thing : if we can have this addition, I say, so much the better. Is not this really what we want ? And do you think we could get it from our liberty friends now ? I do not believe we could. Then would it not be better to wait till we can get it, and not make a fuss beforehand about anything of less moment ? Can you not reconcile Mr. Heworth to this view of things ? The time is not yet come for any open demonstration on our part ; our cause is yet immature ; we have work to do first among ourselves ; we must invoke the help of the Holy Spirit, and enkindle in our hearts individually and socially a deeper earnestness in and devotion to our cause, and a fire of love towards our opponents which shall be our chief weapon to win them over to our side. Our weapons are not yet forged ; we are not yet sufficiently awake and alive. If we make an attack now, we must use meaner weapons which would only reach the pride and passions of our opponents, and cause them to assume an antagonistic attitude towards us, thus retarding rather than advancing the day of our final victory.

"An earnest faith in and adherence to our cause, a sincere charity towards and love for our opponents, and calm appeals to their reason,—these must be our weapons, until the time is ripe for us to make an independent stand with or without them. So let us all keep our eye on the thing we want. Let us bear in mind that the Universalists are pointing at us for our present looseness and inconsistency ; that the consistent Radicals themselves are laughing at us ; that the whole Christian world, slow at best to acknowledge us as fellow disciples, will surely withhold all sympathy from us so long as we remain reticent and equivocal upon this point of vital interest to the whole world."

PREACHING AND WORSHIP.

"The Christian Union," which is one of the raciest, richest, and broadest religious journals we have ever seen, has a correspondent, "Laicus," who discusses the above topic, with fine humor and excellent sense. We copy with pleasure, the article, in the hope that our laity may be stirred by it to ask what they can do to render public worship more attractive and influential for good.

"I read in the papers a good deal of ministerial discussion of the problem how to make the services of the church more attractive. There seems to be an impression, on the part of ministers, that the pulpit has lost its power. And, I observe, it is always of the *pulpit* they speak, as though that were all the church. I read the other day, in the admirable summary of church news which constitutes so valuable a feature of 'The Christian Union,' some statistics tending to show that in Connecticut Congregationalism was failing and Episcopalianism was increasing. I do not much believe in the old adage, 'figures never lie.' On the contrary, according to my observation, they are the nimblest little liars that ever plague and pester credulous and bewildered minds. But still I judge that Congregationalism is not growing very fast in Connecticut. My friend, Mr. Doldrum, who is a member of the board of trustees in the Rev. Mr. Klaptrapp's church, opened his heart to me on this subject the other day.

"'I do not know what we are going to do, Mr. Laicus,' said he. 'We have got a popular preacher. Everybody admires him. He never preaches a dull sermon. And yet it seems almost impossible to get a congregation, or to keep it. He actually had to give notice the other day from the pulpit that if the second service were not better attended he would resign. I believe people do not care about preaching any more. I don't know what the world is coming to.'

"I notice, too, in all the ministerial discussions of this topic, the question is, How shall we make the *preaching of the gospel* more attractive? It is preaching, preaching, preaching, that is discussed. When the minister, in the morning,

gives notice of evening service, it is, 'There will be *preaching* in this house this evening.' The advertisements in the papers are, 'The Rev. Mr. — will *preach* at such a time and in such a place.' When Mr. Doldrum gives me a hospitable invitation, it is, 'Come round and hear our minister the next time you're in New York. We have got a fine preacher, I assure you.' The churches are christened by the preacher's name, as Mr. Dullard's church, Mr. Klaptrapp's church, Mr. Every's church. When we come out of church you will hear the people saying to one another, 'That was a fine sermon,' or, 'What a dull preacher.' For my part, I sometimes wonder what we have any singing, prayer, and reading of the Scripture for. Is it a mere fringe; just trimming to the garment?

"I am a Presbyterian, — or rather, to speak more accurately, a Congregationalist. My father was a Congregational minister. I have a brother in the Congregational ministry. My grandfather was for many years the pillar of a Congregational church. I was born and bred amidst Congregational influences. I was reared in a Congregational Sunday-school. By inheritance, by education, by preference, I am attached to its simple and unritualistic service. And yet I love to go to the Episcopal Church, particularly in the afternoon. If I could do so without occasioning remark, I rather think I should go every Sunday afternoon. I like to go where the minister is not a great preacher, and where the sermon is next to nothing. If it were absolutely nothing, I should like it even better. I like to join in audible voice in the devotions; like to read the responsive psalms; like to join, as I can in our own Wheat-hedge Episcopal Church, where the opera has not yet got a foothold, in the simple and solemn chants which constitute such a feature in its service of song. When I go to the Presbyterian Church I feel that I have been to hear a sermon. When I go to the Episcopal Church I feel that I have been to worship God.

"I took my little boy the other day with me to New York, and we went in to hear the learned and eloquent pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle. Dr. Thompson, I am told, always

closes the long prayer with the Lord's Prayer, which we also use at home, all the family joining in its repetition. When, on this occasion, he began, 'Our Father, which art in heaven,' Johnny joined in with an audible voice. As the rest of the congregation were silent, I hushed him, whereupon he turned to me with a perplexed expression on his face, and the whispered question, 'What does he want to say it all alone by himself for?' I really would like Dr. Thompson's answer to that question.

"One serious difficulty with our Presbyterian and Congregational form of service is that it is no service at all; it is nothing but sermon. It provides very admirably for the mental want of instruction. But this is not the only want. The heart has its wants: one of them is a longing for human sympathy, especially in the higher experiences. This, I suppose, is the meaning of 'public worship.' Theodora, in Disraeli's new novel, says, 'I like to pray alone.' No doubt there are hours when we want to stand alone with God. But there are other hours when we want to feel the throbbings of other hearts beating in love-waves according with our own. Now, as our services are usually conducted, they do not provide for this want. We go away unsatisfied.

"I attended, a few weeks ago, an ordination at the village of Coventry. It was a friend of Maurice's who was to be ordained, and I rode over with him. The services were rather protracted, and, to tell the truth, rather dull. In the midst of them good old Father Rutgers rose to give out a hymn.

"'To relieve the tedium of these exercises,' said he, 'we will sing two verses of the twenty-fifth hymn — and — and — also to the glory of God.'

"The glory of God was an afterthought, and the first thought was the truest if not the best.

"Ordinarily, as it seems to be, the minister cares very little about what he calls the 'preliminary exercises,' and the people care less. Nobody considers himself really late to church if he gets there in time for the sermon. Why can we not borrow some elements of congregational worship from our

Sabbath-school? Why can we not at least all join in the Lord's Prayer, in a responsive reading, and in some simple hymns of praise? My friend, Mr. Hardcap, says it would be imitating the Episcopalians. Very well. If the Episcopalians have anything worth imitating, why not imitate it? Is there any authority for our present *form* of service? In the Jewish Church the whole congregation joined in worship. I judge they did in the early apostolic churches. Why should not we?

"At all events, I am confident that if the ministers want to make their church service meet the wants of the laymen, one thing to do is to make more of the element of public worship. If they do not want to add any new features, let them make more of what they have. Give us hymns of prayer and praise, not mere sermons and exhortations in rhyme. Give us prayers that come warm from the heart, and that, going really to the throne and heart of God, carry us there. Select Scripture that has some heart significance in it, and by reading, if not comment, bring it home to us. The only time I ever attended Spurgeon's church his Scripture reading was longer than his sermon, and worth more. I am sure that if Vandenhoff were to read the story of the Crucifixion, the ladies would not take the time to study each other's bonnets. Now our church service is what? Certainly no service on the part of the laity. We sit still to be read to, to be sung to, to be preached to, to be—yes! to be prayed to. What if we were to read, to sing, to pray, at least a little, ourselves?

"CONVERGING LINES."

All Christians are soon to be summoned to contend for the life of Christianity. All religious men are summoned to build dykes to save religion from the inundation of an ocean of unbelief.

A good Providence seems to be preparing the churches for their great conflict. The spirit of division has spent itself. The churches which have been sundered are either reunited, or are preparing for union. The feeling between sects is

growing more kindly. Sympathy is stronger than antipathy. All the signs show that a day of co-operation and moral unity is drawing near. As soon as hearts are cordially united there will be no power in differences to harm the One Body of Christ, made up of many differing members. — *H. W. Beecher.*

STEPPING HEAVENWARD.

It is hard to climb. To raise ourselves from one degree of grace to another is far more difficult than to shuffle along on a dead level of worldly consistency. But the difficulties of ascent are generally the greater because we do not use the stair provided by our Father. We cannot spring at once to the top of the Rock that is higher than we; we cannot scale the steepes of Christian attainment in a direct line; we must follow the path trod by the Great Forerunner.

The first step is, tribulation working patience. We learn to endure, to wait, to hope on amid discouragements. And although this first step seems so very simple, yet only by it are we enabled to mount the second, patience working experience.

It is not the variety and multitude of events through which a man has passed that makes him wise or efficient; it is the patient spirit in which he has learned to meet them. Having ruled himself in the day of trial, he can be trusted to command his faculties in prosperity. And by this kind of experience he is able to reach a still higher plane, experience working hope. — *The Christian Union.*

• THE article by Dr. Stebbins was written for an earlier number of the Magazine, and in part with reference to questions which have since lost something of their interest. But it contains some views which are never unseasonable; and for these, although requested by him to withhold it, we publish it and commend it to the readers' attention. — *EDS.*

RANDOM READINGS.

BY E. H. SEARS.

CHARLES DICKENS

Was both poet and preacher. Better sermons on human brotherhood, and better adapted to make all hearts feel the ties and the throbbings of a common humanity, are found nowhere. Then you might find page after page of his novels which are poetry in the form of prose. How many of the lyrics which graced the columns of "Household Words" were written by Dickens we do not know, but many of them have the traces of his magical pen. "The Hymn of the Wiltshire Laborers," lately republished in the "Tran-script," is unmatched in beauty and tenderness; and here is a sweet effusion from "Household Words," which illustrates the care of Providence for little things and its watch for the sparrows, taught in the sayings of Jesus:—

LISTENING ANGELS.

Blue against the bluer heavens
Stood the mountain, calm and still;
Two white angels, bending earthward,
Leant upon the hill,

Listening leant those silent angels,
And I, also, longed to hear
What sweet strain of earthly music
Thus could charm their ear.

I heard the sound of many trumpets,
And a war-like march draw nigh;
Solemnly a mighty army
Passed in order by.

But the clang had ceased; the echo
Soon had faded from the hill;
While the angels, calm and earnest,
Leant and listened still.

Then I heard a fainter clamor:
Forge and wheel were clashing near,
And the reapers in the meadow
Singing loud and clear.

When the sunset came in glory,
And the toil of day was o'er,
Still the angels leant in silence,
Listening as before.

Then as daylight slowly vanished,
And the evening mists grew dim,
Solemnly, from distant voices,
Rose a vesper hymn.

But the chant was done ; and, lingering,
Died upon the evening air ;
Yet from the hill the radiant angels
Still were listening there.

Silent came the gathering darkness,
Bringing with it sleep and rest ;
Save a little bird was singing
In her leafy nest.

Through the sounds of war and labor
She had warbled all day long,
While the angels leant and listened
Only to her song.

But the starry night was coming,
And she ceased her little lay ;
From the mountain-top the angels
Slowly passed away.

"THE CHICAGO ADVANCE," when it compared the Unitarian body to a menagerie, one-half of the animals of which were likely to devour the other half, meant, it seems, that the radical wing was likely to absorb all the rest. We have not the least doubt they mean to do it. Then the editor advises us "to abandon a false liberalism." Now if "The Advance" will say what it means by a liberalism which is "false," and how, when, and where we have made ourselves responsible for it, we will abandon it with our whole heart. Until then we don't see anything to abandon. We wish, too, it would say what it regards as "the Christian doctrine and character" on which ecclesiastical fellowship is only to be based, and which can "change a menagerie into the fold of the Good Shepherd."

"THE LIBERAL CHRISTIAN" of June 11 has a long editorial in which the evils and embarrassments which beset the Unitarian body

in being made responsible for unbelief are fully acknowledged. "It weakens and obstructs the external enterprise and prosperity of the body very seriously." "It makes the Unitarian body a hissing and a by-word in the church universal," and does many other bad things of the sort. Why not put a stop to all this, and say in some convention that represents the denomination, frankly, and clearly, and unmistakably, We stand on Christian ground and no other, and follow Jesus Christ as our Leader and Saviour. Why not say this, it is such a very straightforward and simple thing to do? Hear the answer: "*Because we have a history*," says the editorial. We have shown, we think, in several articles of this magazine, that this is the very reason why we *should* say it; that the covenants of nearly three hundred churches have already said it; that all the elder Unitarian churches said it with emphasis; Channing's, Walker's, Ware's, Abbot's, Thompson's, Thayer's, Bancroft's, the Cambridge Church, and the whole sisterhood, said it severally. Did those men understand Christian liberty or not? If one church can say it, and three hundred can say it severally, pray tell us why they cannot say it collectively? "Because we have a history," one would think a pretty good reason for saying it now, and not belying our history. But Rev. A. P. Putnam's powerful sermon, in the same paper, on "The Past, Present, and Future of the Unitarian Body," more than balances, it utterly annihilates the sophistries of the editorial. The sermon, we understand, is to be put into pamphlet form. May it fly to all the churches on the wings of the wind.

N. P. WILLIS, if we dimly remember right, wrote this description of a hot day, the truth of which some had a vivid experience of June 25:—

"The pavements are all hissing hot, the sky above is brazen,
And every head as good as dead the sun can set his rays on;
The lean, lank-looking skeletons go stalking pale and gloomy;
The fat, like red-hot frying-pans, send hotter fancies through me.
I wake from dreams of polar ice on which I've been a slider,
Like fishes dreaming of the sea and waking in the spider."

"THE COMMONWEALTH" has the following anecdote in its racy column of miscellany:—

"Why was I born?" exclaimed Anna Dickinson, in beginning one of her fine flights of eloquence on the equality of women,—

"Why was I born?" she repeated, swelling her exultant form, stamping her foot, and looking earnestly over the audience. "Give it up," exclaimed a puzzled chap in the gallery; "ask us something easier."

"NEARER MY GOD, TO THEE."

"The Independent" publishes the following interesting letter, from Rev. Samuel Longfellow, in relation to this beautiful hymn:—

"CAMBRIDGE, March 28, 1870.

"Mrs. Sarah Flower Adams was an English lady, an intimate friend of Mr. William J. Fox, the distinguished liberal preacher and member of Parliament. The hymn 'Nearer, my God, to Thee' was printed in a little collection of 'Hymns and Anthems' prepared by Mr. Fox for his chapel in South Place, Finsbury, London, and which is still used there under his successor, Mr. M. D. Conway. The hymn appeared in this country for the first time, I believe, in the 'Disciples' Hymn Book,' a collection prepared by Rev. J. F. Clarke for his church in Boston, and published in 1844. Sir Roundell Palmer, in the first edition of his 'Book of Praise,' gives, erroneously, 1848 as the date of the original appearance of the hymn. It has since become a general favorite, even in 'orthodox' quarters, where I suppose its heretical origin is not suspected. I say *heretical*, for I presume Mrs. Adams to have shared the theological opinions of Mr. Fox, which were what would now be called 'radical Unitarian.'

"Several of Mrs. Adams' beautiful hymns were set to music by her sister, Miss Eliza Flower.

"I found in England an impression that Mrs. Adams was an American. I do not know how this originated, unless from some portion of her family having emigrated for a while to this country, as I think I have heard. I do not know that she herself was ever here.

"It would be a singular and interesting fact if it should prove true that two of the hymns most esteemed in our churches for their devout feeling should have been the composition of persons to whom the great majority of the churches would refuse the Christian name. The other that I have in my mind is the hymn of Helen Maria Williams, beginning, —

"While Thee I seek, Protecting Power,
Be my vain wishes stilled."

Miss Williams was, I believe, a friend of Mary Woolstoncraft Godwin. She resided in France during the first Revolution; and her liberal opinions would have inclined her, we may suppose, to the fellowship of the 'Theophilanthropists,' a body of pure Theists, who preached a religious system founded on love to God and love to man (hence their name) in several of the Parisian churches, after the suppression of the Roman Catholic worship. On the restoration of that church, under Napoleon I., they were themselves suppressed. This supposition in regard to Miss Williams I have not the means of verifying. Do you know anything of her?

"Very truly yours,

"SAMUEL LONGFELLOW."

SOLOMON.

A FABLE. FROM THE GERMAN.

'Twas on a day of festal state
In Israel's land of old,
Upon his throne of gold,
King Solomon in youthful wisdom sat,
Looking benignant down
His people's plaint to hear,
To dry the sufferer's tear,
And merit, with its due reward, to crown.

From north and south the people round him press,
And David's heir and Israel's monarch bless.
Among the rest a venerable sire,
For piety through all the country known,
Drew near the golden throne,
And spoke, in words like these, his kind desire.

"If, O my king, before thy face
Thy servant has found grace,
Then to thy brother's child that grace be shown,
To Absalom's unhappy son,
Who in his father's ruin captive taken,
Now sick, despised, by all but me forsaken,
Breathes a deep dungeon's poisoned air."

The son of David said, "Thy prayer
 I've read in thy fair soul, thy aspect mild.
 When in the outer hall I saw thee stand,
 Presagingly I gave command
 To liberate my brother's child."
 Even as he spoke, there knelt the rescued youth,
 Kissing with tears the hand that made him free.

Sophist! who in thy wisdom canst not see
 Of prayer the wisdom or the truth,
 Because man cannot change the Almighty's will,
 What if Jehovah from of old
 Did the long line of future men behold,
 With hands in prayer held forth, approaching still
 The altar of his grace?
 What if this knowledge found its place
 In his great plan, on the unuttered prayer
 Such gifts bestowing as would not impair
 His wisdom's lofty purpose? His decree
 Forever changeless thus shall be;
 And yet it had not been the same,
 But that before him came
 Each prayer by kneeling virtue brought,
 Known, ere t'was spoken, by his infinite thought.

S. G. B.

THE CLOISTER.

THOUGHT never knew material bound or place,
 Nor footsteps may the roving fancy trace:
 Peace cannot learn within a roof to house,
 Nor cloister hold us safe within our vows.

The cloistered heart may brave the common air,
 And the world's children breathe the holiest prayer;
 Build for us, Lord, and in thy temple reign!
 Watch with us, Lord, our watchman wakes in vain!

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

AMERICAN POLITICAL ECONOMY; Including Strictures on the Management of the Currency and the Finances since 1861, with a Chart showing the Fluctuations in the Price of Gold. By Francis Bowen, Alford Professor, &c., in Harvard College. Pp. 495. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

Prof. Bowen has given, not simply a revised edition of his well-known text-book of "Political Economy," but substantially a new work, written in view of the costly and wonderful experiments in finance which our country has been practising the last eight years. He believes that, starting with a very few fundamental axioms, each nation should have a political economy of its own; that, to be worth anything practically, those maxims need be restated and illustrated among the very group of facts to which we apply them. Accordingly, the adjective in his title is not mere claptrap, but describes what is *implied* in the argument throughout, and what is *exclusively* dealt with in perhaps one-third of the book.

We cannot, in our space, undertake to criticise, or even to state what Mr. Bowen's doctrines are. We can only say that they are given with great directness and clearness of style, and with the abundant illustrations they require, in these pages. In particular, the chart, which is prepared with great care, comprises an amount of curious information and exposition, which it would not be easy to find elsewhere in the same space. The times which mark the fluctuations in the gold-market—especially what a meteorologist would call the violent financial storms—are crossed with the dates of campaigns, battles, acts of Congress, or other events that interfered to disturb the public confidence. The volume, in short, together with its value as an instructive manual of the science, is a fresh, interesting, and authentic record of some of the most striking revolutions which politics or economy ever had to deal with. There is no topic of science on which our people need elementary instruction more than this, and nothing on which the politics of the next few years are so sure to turn.

The main value of the study, we suppose, lies in those branches of it where there is practically no difference among economists.

Probably nine-tenths of Mr. Bowen's book occupies this neutral ground. In regard to the open questions, such as that of protection and free trade, his argument, even if fallacious, has the advantage of being *against* the strong drift of opinion at present, and so, at worst, would have only the effect of a delay of judgment. The question, however, is one, properly speaking, of practice rather than theory; and what is a correct answer now, or was five years ago, may be quite wrong for five years hence. Practically, we suspect that we differ a little in our judgment from Mr. Bowen; but his statement of the case is brief, intelligent, and fair.

In another disputed matter—the Malthusian doctrine of population—we suspect him of tilting at a man of straw. Of course, as applied to the world at large, any point as to undue increase of population is wildly absurd. But the grain of truth in that theory is pungently illustrated in every crowded den of population, and in the wretchedness of many crowded families. It is proved in history by those vast movements of population impelled by the pressure of numbers on the means of subsistence. And considering the enormous waste which is going on of such magazines of natural wealth as forests, coal-mines, and oil-wells, it has a very practical bearing in our speculations of the future. As Mr. March shows, in "Man and Nature," civilization hitherto has been a destructive process, leaving many of the finest regions (like Asia Minor) apparently incapable of restoration. And the argument of pence deserves some better answer than to expose the mere extravagance of statement with which it is sometimes coupled.

J. H. A.

THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM; a Kingdom not of this World, not in this World, but to Come in the Heavenly Country of the Resurrection from the Dead, and of the Retribution of all Things. By Senior Harvard. 8vo. pp. 463. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger.

We do not entirely understand this book, and we are doubtful whether the author does. But it is full of *devout thought*, and by this phrase we mean not mere expressions of pious feeling, but the earnest onreaching and upreaching of the mind, striving, concurrently with the affections, to lift the veil from things unseen and eternal. The author's thesis is, that all the divine promises in the Scriptures are addressed and applicable to all, from Adam to the end of time, who do not close their hearts against them, and that

these promises are to have their consummation in our own renovated world. "Despise not prophesyings," said St. Paul; and in the spirit of his injunction we cannot but regard with sincere reverence a treatise like this, which owes its existence solely to a dear love of Christ and his church. P.

WONDERS OF ARCHITECTURE is another volume of the "Library of Wonders" in course of publication by Charles Scribner & Co. It is of more varied interest than the title would indicate, being rich in historic memorials. It ranges through the marvels of Greek, Roman, Italian, Gothic, French, and English Architecture, with fifty wood-cuts as illustrations. It commences with the rude Celtic monuments and proceeds in chronological order through the eras which mark the development of architectural science. All the celebrated structures that have ever existed from the tower of Babel to Holyrood House are described and illustrated. The work is a translation from the French of L. Lefevre, with the added chapter on English architecture by R. Donald. S.

THE BROKEN SEAL, or Personal Reminiscences of the Morgan Abduction and Murder, by Samuel D. Greene, published by the author, and for sale at No. 13 Beacon Street, carries us back forty-four years, to the days of the Anti-Masonic party in politics, when the excitement shook the State of New York, and for a while shook Free-Masonry well-nigh out of existence. Mr. Greene was himself a seceding Mason, and subsequently an Anti-Masonic lecturer, and tells apparently an unvarnished tale. He tells all about the abduction of Morgan, how, where, and when he was disposed of, with the confession of one of the three men on whom by lot devolved the "duty" of putting him out of existence. The danger of secret societies, especially when widely extended, is the moral lesson of the work. It has all the painful interest of tragedy. S.

PASSAGES FROM THE ENGLISH NOTE-BOOKS OF NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE, in two volumes, have been published by Fields, Osgood & Co., compiled by Sophia Hawthorne. They are given as the best answer that could be made to the urgent demand for a life or memoir of Mr. Hawthorne. These extracts from private records and letters not intended by the author for publication give the reader glimpses of his interior life and prevailing moods such as his intimate friends found in their intercourse with him. They illustrate his character so far as they go, and at the same time serve

as charming sketches, noted down upon the spot by a man of the keenest insight, of English life, manners, and character. The reader is brought by them into company with some of the most distinguished of the men and women of the times as Hawthorne met them and knew them, — Macaulay, the Brownings, Harriet Martineau, Tupper, Douglass Jerrold, Thackeray, &c., — and there are off-hand sketches of English and Scotch scenery which have become classic ground to all lovers of English romance. These volumes will correct an erroneous impression about Hawthorne which many of his countrymen have, — that his moods were morbid, and that there was something acrid in his temperament, — impressions which his constitutional reserve and reticence served to confirm. These sketches show much of heart-sunshine and kindly judgment of character. We think the volumes would have been put in more presentable shape, and their contents made more easily accessible, by a division into chapters and a table of contents. s.

POEMS BY DANTE GABRIEL ROSSETTI. Roberts Brothers.

Mystical and wonderful, not only shedding a weird light over common things, but opening vast and dissolving vistas into realms where the wing of fancy never played before. Read them the second and third time, and even unto the seventh, and still a new and subtle aroma breathes over you from unknown skies. So these poems impress us, though we have not yet half explored this little volume. "The Blessed Danuzel," "Jenny," "A Little While," "The Sea Limits," "The Refusal of Aid between Nations," "Vain Virtues," are among the gems of the book, which glitters with gems, however, from beginning to end. The sonnets are unmatched by anything we have read since Wordsworth wrote. We have not room now for a review of the volume; but the reader, if he has music in him, may be sure to have it waked up when he opens it. It marks the advent of a new genius to shed a charm over the dusty ways of this world, and allure us upward and forward to mystic heights whose scenery is tantalizing for being half revealed. s.

THE ELEMENTS OF TACHYGRAPHY, by David Philip Lindsley, published by Otis Clapp, is a new system of short-hand writing, said by those who have tried it to be a vast improvement on the old system of phonography and all other systems of short-hand. We have not tried it nor studied it; but professors of the art have recommended it as invaluable, and as bringing the art of short-hand within the reach of all. s.